

Elias Hicks

A Defence of the
Christian Doctrines
of the
Society of Friends.

D-46



A DEFENCE

OF THE

CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES

OF THE

SOCIETY OF FRIENDS:

BEING A REPLY TO THE CHARGE OF DENYING

THE THREE THAT BEAR RECORD IN HEAVEN,

THE DIVINITY AND ATONEMENT OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS
CHRIST, AND THE AUTHENTICITY AND DIVINE AUTHORITY OF
THE HOLY SCRIPTURES,

RECENTLY REVIVED AGAINST THE EARLY QUAKERS, BY THE FOLLOWERS OF

ELIAS HICKS.

IN TWO PARTS.

THE FIRST PART CONTAINING

A refutation of a Pamphlet lately published, entitled "The Sandy Foundation Shaken, &c" to which are added, Extracts from the writings of divers of our primitive Friends on the Divinity of Christ, Atonement, the Scriptures, &c.;" in which the compilers' mutilations and perversions of the language and meaning of the authors whom they quote, are detected and exposed.

PART SECOND, CONSISTING OF

Extracts from the writings of FOX, PENN, BARCLAY, PENNINGTON, WHITEHEAD, CLARIDGE and others, showing the consistency of their belief with the doctrines of HOLY SCRIPTURE.

PHILADELPHIA

1825.



PREFACE.

A PAMPHLET has recently made its appearance in this city, entitled "The Sandy Foundation Shaken, &c. by Wm. Penn, to which are added, Extracts from the writings of divers of our primitive Friends on the Divinity of Christ, Atonement, the Scriptures, &c.;" the obvious intention of which, is to make it appear, that the worthy founders of the Society of Friends, concurred with the Socinians and modern Unitarians, in denying these important doctrines of the Christian religion.

It is now incontrovertibly established by the writings, as well as the public preaching of Elias Hicks, that he denies the miraculous conception, and the divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; the virtue of that most satisfactory sacrifice for sin, which he made of himself upon the cross, without the gates of Jerusalem, and likewise the authenticity, genuineness, and authority of the Holy Scriptures of Truth. His adherents being no longer able to deny these charges, nor to screen him, by saying that he is misunderstood; are now attempting to prove, that in thus rejecting some of the most important and precious doctrines of the Christian religion, he does no more than was done by the early Quakers.

This was a task not to be performed without much labour and *contrivance*—full and fair quotations would not answer their purpose, but prove the contrary of that which they wished to establish, and therefore the compilers of this pamphlet, have resorted to the disingenuous stratagem of *mutilating, altering,* and grossly perverting the language and obvious meaning of the authors, whose writings they quote. In the following pages we shall bring ample proof of the validity of these charges, and show that they have committed acts of great injustice towards those worthy men, whose names they have adduced, to sanction doctrines which they declared they never held nor owned. Our present remarks will be confined to the contradictions and misrepresentations contained in their preface.

It is a truth established by long experience, that not only a frequent *recurrence*, but also a *firm adherence*, to its original principles, is essentially necessary to the preservation of every religious society. But in order to realize the advantages of this important truth, it is absolutely necessary for the members of every such society, to be able to determine, what those ori-

ginal principles are ; and it is evident that for this purpose they must be in possession of some declaration which can inform them, what the peculiar points of belief or practice were, which formed the great terms of the compact into which their predecessors entered, and in which themselves have now become parties. Hence the obvious necessity, according to the maxim laid down by the authors of the preface, that every society should have its declaration of faith. Obvious however as this is, and indispensable as the authors have thus made it, they seem soon to have forgotten, or else not perceived their own admission ; for immediately after, they assert that the Quakers rejected *all* creeds and confessions of faith. How then we would ask, do the authors determine, what those *original principles* are which they recommend us to recur to ; or how do they ascertain, that Elias Hicks does not “ hold and propagate doctrines and opinions contrary to the doctrines and opinions of primitive Friends.”

The word *creed*, signifies no more than a form of words, expressive of the belief of a person or society ; and is synonymous with confession of faith. Every declaration whether oral or written, which contains any thing *believed*, is a creed ; it is a confession of faith ; and consequently if, (as the authors assert) the early Quakers rejected *all* creeds and confessions of faith, it follows that they had no first principles or belief whatever. To recommend us, therefore, to recur to “ original principles” and to assert that the doctrines of E. H. are coincident with those of the early Friends ; and at the same time to deny that the early Friends had any principles or doctrines, is a palpable exhibit of absurdity and contradiction.

The authors assert, that the individuals composing the Society in its commencement, “ had become disgusted with the many palpable errors in *faith* and practice prevalent among religious professors.” Now if they withdrew from the communion of other religious professors, in consequence of their many errors in *faith* as well as practice, it must have been, because these *errors in faith*, were inconsistent with *their own doctrines and belief* ; and the Quakers must have had some written declaration of their own faith, whereby they showed that they did not hold those errors. This then was their creed and confession of faith ; and how can the authors assert that they rejected *all* creeds and confessions of faith ? Their own assertions mutually prove each other to be untrue.

The authors also tell us that “ they sought for, and embraced only, what they believed to be substantial truths, and the realities of religion.” How, we would ask, do they ascertain that the Quakers embraced substantial truths, or that they believed their doctrines to be the realities of religion, if they had re-

jected all creeds and confessions of faith? Could the early Quakers have embraced or believed in *any substantial* truths, if they had rejected all belief? The sources whence the authors of the preface, derive the knowledge of those substantial truths, and realities of religion, which they say the Society of Friends embraced, are undoubtedly those writings in which they declare what they *did believe*; and these are *as certainly* their confessions or declarations of faith.

Again, say the authors, “a zealous adherence to their principles, and a faithful discharge of their religious duties, soon rendered them obnoxious to the derision and persecution of both priests and people.” Now we can readily believe that the faithful discharge of religious duties, rendered them obnoxious to scorn and suffering; but we are at a loss to comprehend how the Quakers could zealously adhere to *principles*, when they had none; or how such an adherence, to principles of which the world *could know nothing*, (since they rejected all creeds and confessions of faith,) should render them obnoxious to derision and persecution.

If the Quakers confessed no belief—if they owned no creed, if they declared no particular faith, the world could not know that they had any. Such are the strange contradictions and absurdities, which these authors have run themselves into, in their anxiety to apologize for the unbelief of Elias Hicks.

The authors are either ignorant of the history of the people, whose faith they pretend to give us; or what is still more culpable, wilfully misrepresent them; when they assert, that they rejected all creeds and confessions of faith.

Not only individuals, but the society, has at different periods published to the world, full and ample confessions of their faith, on various important points of christian doctrine; some of which we shall notice.

In 1658, but a few years after the rise of the society, Richard Farnsworth, a distinguished minister, published a “Confession and profession of faith in God, &c.” In 1668, William Penn, being imprisoned in the Tower, upon the charges of denying the divinity of Christ, and of being a Socinian, published a declaration of his faith in God, and in Jesus Christ our Lord, which is included in his “Innocency with her Open Face, or an Apology for the Sandy Foundation Shaken;” a *part* of which, the compilers have inserted in their pamphlet. It begins thus: “I sincerely own and unfeignedly believe,” &c. We would ask, is not this a creed or confession of faith?

In the year 1671, George Fox wrote a declaration or confession of the faith of the Society of Friends, addressed to the Governor and Council, &c. of Barbadoes; in order to clear himself and his brethren, from the false accusation of those.

who said they “denied God, Christ Jesus, and the Scriptures of Truth.”—In 1682 he published another, embracing other points of christian faith, which may be seen in his answer to to all such as falsely say the Quakers are no christians, &c.

In 1673, Robert Barclay published his treatise, entitled *A Catechism and Confession of Faith, &c.*, as held by the people called Quakers; which was, and continues to be, fully owned and approved by all true Quakers. It has been several times reprinted by order of the Society.

In 1689, G. Whitehead, and others, drew up a declaration, or confession of faith, to be subscribed to by Friends, in order that they might avail themselves of the benefit of the act for granting liberty of conscience, passed in the reign of William and Mary. This confession included a belief in the Holy Three that bear record in Heaven—the Godhead and manhood of Jesus Christ, and the authenticity of Holy Scripture.

In the year 1692, a declaration and confession of faith, signed by eight distinguished Friends on behalf of the Society, was published in London; and Francis Bugg, an apostate Quaker, having charged the Quakers with holding *Socinian* notions, denying the divinity of Jesus Christ, &c.; a short declaration of faith was drawn up in the same year, signed by thirty-one Friends, on behalf of the Society, and published. It contains a clear confession of their full belief in the divinity and atonement of Jesus Christ and the authenticity of Holy Scripture. We could, if it were needful, refer to other declarations of the kind, which the Society has had occasion to revive from time to time. Sewell, in his history of the Quakers, speaking of the charges alleged against them by George Keith, says: “And since he [G. K.] had contradicted that, which formerly he had asserted, and defended in good earnest; and charged the Quakers, with a *belief which they never owned to be theirs*; they found themselves obliged, publickly to set forth their faith *anew in print, which they had often before asserted, both in words and in writing, thereby to manifest that their belief was really orthodox, and agreeable with the Holy Scriptures.*” This confession of faith which Sewell alludes to, may be seen at length, in the 2nd vol. of his *History*, p. 499, and seq.

Thus we see, that it is both untrue, and unfair, to charge the primitive Quakers, with “rejecting all creeds and confessions of faith,” as though they either denied all doctrines of every kind, or were indifferent what faith their members adopted. Such is not the case. There was no society, who more frequently declared to the world, the consistency of their doctrines with the Holy Scriptures; invariably making *these* the test in all controversies with their opponents, and declaring

that whatsoever was contrary thereto, though offered under the sacred sanction of inward, immediate revelation, they utterly rejected and denied. The teaching and doctrine of their ministers, was founded upon, and proved by the Bible; and some of them carried them in their pockets, when out from home upon gospel missions, and preached with them in their hands. We have several instances of this kind, in our honourable Elder George Fox, who was a man mighty in the scripture.

The object of the authors, in making this unfounded accusation, can only be to break down the barrier of sound doctrine, and make way for the rejection of those primary and fundamental articles of christian faith, which all true Quakers have ever held and owned; that are the very basis, upon which the society was first founded, and on which, if it stand at all, it must continue to be built. This foundation, together with the Holy Scriptures, Elias Hicks is striving to destroy, and to aid him in this attempt, the authors and compilers of this book, present us with their garbled and interpolated, and perverted extracts. But happily, this very book itself, defeats their purpose:—Mangled and distorted as it is, the system of doctrine which it presents, is widely different from that of Elias Hicks; while the unmanly shifts which the compilers have stooped to, in order to force the authors to speak *their* language; is a sure indication of the weakness; nay, worse, the turpitude of their cause.

They have betaken themselves to the same arts, as were practised by the persecutors and opponents of Friends, in the beginning; have adduced, in many cases, the same passages, and all to prove the very same accusations, viz: a denial of the divinity of Christ—of his atonement, and of the authority of Holy Scripture. Thus they have fairly entered the ranks of calumniators, and classed themselves with T. Hicks, Vincent, Maddox, Ives, Brown, Bugg, Leslie, Faldo, Mitchell, Clapham and Keith; and more recently, their worthy colleague in the work of misrepresentation, William Craig Brownlee.

That the primitive friends, believed the revelation of the Holy Spirit of Christ Jesus in the soul, to be the foundation of true and living faith, is readily admitted; for it is indeed, the very *corner stone* of our holy profession: but they also declared as positively, to speak in the language of Barclay, that “these divine inward revelations, which we make absolutely necessary, for the building up of true faith; *neither do, nor can ever contradict, the outward testimony of the scriptures, or right and sound reason.*”

William Penn, defending himself against the exceptions of

the Bishop of Cork, to a paper called "Gospel Truths, &c." says,—“Now if being general, and *keeping to the terms of scripture*, be a fault; we are like to be more vile with the Bishop: For, thanks be to God, *that only is our creed*; and with good reason too, since it is fit, *that should only conclude*, and be the *creed of Christians*, which the Holy Ghost could only propose and require us to believe.—For if the comment is made the creed, instead of the text; from that time we believe not in God, but in man.” Works, fol. ed. vol. ii. 896.

It is therefore in vain, for Elias Hicks, or his followers, to screen their unbelief, by pleading further revelation or greater light.—If they have seen *beyond the scriptures*, they are not Quakers; for Barclay positively asserts, that all such pretences, are mere delusions of the enemy. The Quakers have *always* appealed to the Bible, for the proof of their doctrine; and it is a sure indication, that *they* are neither Quakers nor Christians, who are afraid to submit their doctrines to its test.

When we reflect upon the awful defection in faith and in practice, which the principles of Elias Hicks have introduced into the society, we can cordially reciprocate the mournful language of the authors of the preface. The *demoralizing*, the disorganizing effects of his sentiments are becoming every day more and more obvious; and while we view the diminution of religious watchfulness and holy circumspection, which is apparent in many who have adopted them; whose minds in earlier and better days, were deeply imbued with the fear of God, and the love of Christ, and whose daily prayer was, that they might be preserved in humility, and in faithful devotion to the Lord's cause;—when we remember the days of their espousals, and the peacefulness and holy quiet which they then enjoyed, we are ready indeed to say, “how is the gold become dim, how is the most fine gold changed.”

How many are there, who, deceived by specious pretences to greater spirituality, and to the guidance of the Holy Spirit; lured by the unlawful love of novelty, and a restless desire to be prying into the inscrutable mysteries of God, have left that precious state of humble dependence and holy faith, that true tenderness of spirit, that teachableness and conscientious fear of doing wrong, which they knew something of in the day of their early visitation; and are now determined to choose for themselves; to believe what they please, and deny what they dislike,—until they have at last come to reject the doctrines of Holy Scripture, to deny the Lord that bought them, and are “rapidly merging into the popular doctrines” of infidelity. They are not only “receding from genuine quakerism,” and

approaching the communion of modern unbelievers, but by the most unfair means, are endeavouring to press into their company, many honourable christian Quakers, who have long since fallen asleep in Jesus; and who in life, and in death, declared that they had no fellowship with such unfruitful works of darkness.

It is not, however, surprising that those who have thus swerved from the ancient faith of the gospel, as held forth by this society, are anxious to gloss over their pernicious principles, and to plume themselves with the credit of antiquity and the authority of "primitive friends." There is something so forbidding—so unpromising, so utterly comfortless and unamiable, in the principles and character of an unbeliever, that few have been found, who were bold enough to throw off the mask, and voluntarily to embrace it. They have generally sought to soften down the term, and to give their doctrines a more inviting aspect, by pretending that they differed not in essentials from sound christians; that they only stripped christianity of human trappings, and taught it "in its native excellence and purity," and that many pious men were of their way of thinking. But the veil is too thin to conceal the deformity which lies beneath. Infidelity, in its most specious forms, has been too often detected, and too fully exposed, to give them any hope of success, and the time is at hand, when they will be made fully manifest.

The society of Friends, holds the same relation to other christian professors, that ever it did. William Penn, in his "Testimony to the truth as held by the people called Quakers," written in 1698, says, "Because we are separated from the publick communion and worship, it is too generally concluded, that we deny the doctrines received by the church, and consequently introduce a new religion; whereas we differ *least*, where we are thought to differ *most*. For, setting aside some school terms, *we hold the substance of those doctrines, believed by the Church of England, as to God, Christ, Spirit, Scripture, repentance, sanctification, remission of sin, holy living and the resurrection of the just and unjust to eternal rewards and punishments.* But that wherein we differ *most*, is about worship, and conversation, and the *inward qualification* of the soul, by the work of God's Spirit thereon, in pursuance of *these good and generally received doctrines.*" 2d vol. fol. p. 881.

It is the certain effect of a faithful submission to the leadings of the Holy Spirit of Christ, to bring its followers into an humble and sincere belief in the sublime doctrines of the christian religion; and as occasion requires, to qualify them earnestly to contend for that precious faith once delivered to the saints, against those who are labouring to destroy it. Hence, it is not sur-

prising, that the doctrines of Elias Hicks have been critically examined; and their numerous inconsistencies, and contradictions of Holy Scripture, plainly exposed. It is what every man must expect, when he attempts an innovation upon the established doctrines, and discipline, of the society, of which he has professed himself a member. In perusing these inquiries into the nature and effects of his principles, we have not perceived, that any unfair or harsh measures have been pursued, or any opprobrious epithets cast upon him. It is true his views have been proved to be coincident with those held by most deists; but this coincidence is *his* fault, not the fault of his *reviewers*.

The authors of the preface say, that the Reviews are "teeming with misrepresentations and perversions;" but they prudently decline attempting to give any examples. The charge is so manifestly unfounded, that it does not need a serious reply; and as the best refutation of it, we earnestly recommend a candid perusal of the Reviews themselves. Their assertion, that "his private letters have been surreptitiously obtained," must recoil with double force upon themselves. It is well known that a part of Elias Hicks' letter to William B. Irish, was printed in New York by his own friends, more than three years ago, and many manuscript copies of it industriously circulated by them; that addressed to Dr. N. Sheemaker, was shown to many persons, in the original; copies were taken by Elias Hicks' particular friends, and handed about, with high encomiums, for its excellence and the purity of the doctrines it contained; and *before it was printed*, was so effectually published by *his own adherents*, that hundreds of persons, in remote parts of the country, as well as in the city, were acquainted with its contents; that to Dr. Atlee was *first* printed, published, and widely circulated by his own friends; and, indeed, in every instance within our knowledge, his letters have been extensively known abroad, before they were put into print.

The authors of the preface, could not be ignorant of these facts; and it ill becomes *them*, to assert that the letters were surreptitiously obtained, when it is so clearly apparent, that while they could be circulated, without an antidote to their poisonous contents, and while their errors and contradictions were not exposed; the *friends* of Elias Hicks, were forward in disseminating them, and were not sparing in their encomiums, of what they *now* wish to apologize for, by telling us that they "are mere sketches of his views," "insufficiently guarded." Elias Hicks, however, who is the best judge in this matter, tells us, they are the result of *due consideration* and *reflection*.

The authors tell us, they have compiled their pamphlet to

rescue Elias Hicks from unmerited censure. Do they suppose, that to stigmatize primitive Friends, with the unjust odium of holding antichristian tenets, will extricate Elias Hicks, from the dilemma in which he has involved himself? His principles *merit censure*; and to free himself from it, he must abandon those principles. The authority of their names, could he justly adduce them, would not make his principles correct. But why should so much pains and labour be bestowed, to support the tottering fabrick of Elias Hicks's doctrine, when his followers profess to consider doctrines of no importance? Why do his advocates, wring and torture the writings of "primitive Friends," in the vain hope of extracting some sentiment, that will yield them the semblance of authority; and yet shrink, with conscious fear, from the sure test of Holy Scripture? Why do they struggle so hard to make their mutilated extracts from Friends' writings, *the test* of doctrines, when they disclaim any test at all? There is a sentiment of the learned and pious Locke, which so well describes the cause of that repugnance, which Elias Hicks and his fastidious followers, manifest to the scriptures, that we are induced to quote it. "But the great antipathy, (says he,) which a thoughtless tribe among us, (for simple apprehension is a very metaphysical kind of thinking,) professes against the scriptures, is best accounted for, from hence; because they make us acquainted with ourselves, and teach us sundry unfashionable duties, which *they* are determined, never to copy after; and, therefore, as, it happens in too many other cases, *the scriptures being against them, they are against the scriptures.*"

The compilers invite their readers to examine the works of primitive Friends, assuring them that their extracts "have been carefully transcribed and compared." This looks like candour, but, as it is only the *semblance* of it, is, therefore, the more injurious, and the more criminal. The works of the authors from whom they quote, are accessible to comparatively but a small number; and few of these have time or inclination to read them carefully; and where a pamphlet is put forth to the world, containing numerous garbled or perverted quotations, under the imposing aspect of candour and honesty, a great proportion of undiscerning readers may be deceived. The compilers have not thought proper to state the doctrines of Elias Hicks, as contained in his letters, that the reader might compare them with the sentiments exhibited in the compilation; and the danger of deception is thus rendered greater, as many may be induced to imagine that the extracts are a faithful delineation of them.

We unite with the authors of the preface in affectionately inviting the candid and *upright*, to read carefully the extracts

which the compilers have made to support the principles of Elias Hicks, and to *notice, especially*, the mutilation of many of the sentences, and the violence which is done to the authors' meaning, in many places, by the omission of parts which are immediately in connexion with what they have quoted, and which are *necessary to understand the true meaning of the writer*. We would also invite the reader to observe, that many of the omitted sentences, contain clear declarations of the belief of the author, in *those very doctrines*, which the compilers are endeavouring to make them deny; and hence it is not difficult to see *why* they have not had the honesty to quote them *fully and fairly*. Thus, the reader will be enabled to decide whether *some* have not "obviously departed, *not only* from the original grounds of *faith* assumed by our pious and enlightened predecessors," but also from that regard to truth, strict integrity, and justice, by which those dignified sons of the morning were so honourably characterized.

How high soever infidelity may rear her haughty crest, or however her votaries may vaunt themselves over the humble Christian, one thing is certain; her reign has ever been short. For the religion of Jesus Christ, and for the doctrines of the Bible, we have nothing to fear. We repose ourselves, in reverent confidence, upon the unfailling promises of God, who has solemnly assured us, that *they shall prevail*. Much as the freethinker boasts of his enlightened views, and liberal sentiments, and free inquiry, he has never yet been able to stand the test of fair investigation. The Bible has stood the storms of ages, and the cavils and criticisms of unbelievers, who could summon to their aid the richest stores of human learning; but their greatest ingenuity, sharpened by the most inveterate malice, has only served to show the impregnable strength of the basis upon which it is founded. It still stands; and it will continue to stand, when all the flimsy systems which have been arrayed against it, shall have mouldered away into irreparable ruin, and the remembrance of them be blotted out from under Heaven.

We have no personal enmity to Elias Hicks. We utterly disclaim any such feeling. It is the *doctrines*, not the man, that we oppose. We often deeply deplore his lamentable apostacy from that holy faith which we believe was once committed to him; we mourn over his aberration from the path of Christian humility and obedience; and we mourn, too, for the many innocent and unwary souls whom he has allured, to tread with him, the thorny paths of unbelief, and whom he has robbed, we fear, of that sustaining hope, and holy confidence, which they once enjoyed, in the Captain of their salvation. Had he stood as a little child in the obedience of faith, relying upon Jesus Christ,

instead of leaning to his own understanding, he might, at this day, have been a pillar in the house of God, that should go no more out. The Lord, of his infinite mercy, grant that he may yet be brought to see, and to tremble, at the awful gulf upon the very brink of which he now totters: that, through unfeigned repentance, the evil heart of unbelief may be removed, and a capacity graciously given, to look with full faith to the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world; that thus, through the merits and mercies of a crucified Redeemer, he may finally obtain that eternal life, which remains to be "the gift of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

We shall now close with the following extract from a sermon, delivered at Bristol, England, the 19th of 5th month, 1767, by that eminent minister of the gospel, Samuel Fothergill; in which he beautifully and feelingly declares his full and firm belief, as also that of the society of Friends, in those very doctrines which Elias Hicks denies. We earnestly exhort our readers to compare the sentiments in this extract, and indeed throughout the whole volume of his sermons, with those contained in Elias Hicks' sermons, lately published in this city. The contrast is truly affecting.

"We follow not formally, but we believe in, and are convinced, fully convinced, of the doctrines of the Christian religion; the incarnation, glory, life, death, mighty miracles, and various circumstances relative to the holy life of Jesus, 'as in the volume of the book it is written;' and can, in an awful and reverent sense, commemorate those vast and most interesting events. We admire, with humble hearts and minds, the awful transactions of that time, when sweat, like drops of blood, ran from the face of the Holy Jesus: when being in agony, he prayed more earnestly; when he was betrayed, his sacred head crowned with thorns, his face spit upon, he was most ignominiously treated, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, he complained not.

"We behold him in his agonies on Calvary's mount, *offering himself as a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world*; that he might purify us, *by the shedding of his precious blood!* 'More precious than the blood of bulls and goats,' or any other that was shed under the law. We believe in his *amazing mercy in offering himself there*, when laden with the *immense weight of the sins of mankind*, and the immediate sense of the Father's presence withdrawn, he was left to suffer alone; under this extreme pressure crying out, 'Eloi, Eloi, lama sabacthani,' was crucified, dead and buried.

"Here pause a little, I beseech you. Contemplate the adorable theme! Acknowledge, Oh man, that unbounded gratitude which is ever due from thee: Oh, my soul, 'how much

owest thou unto thy Lord.' I know we have been stigmatized, as disbelieving the truths of the Christian religion. However I call the divine Record, the Saviour of the world, that was *offered a sacrifice without the gates of Jerusalem*, to witness for my belief; that he was sent from God to do the 'Father's will;' and I do, without controversy, believe that he was 'God manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, believed on in the world, and received up into glory.' We do not at all doubt that God was 'in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself;' that Christ *gave himself a ransom for all*, to be testified in due time, and that '*with his stripes we were healed.*'

"By virtue of that holy sacrifice, the remission of sins is gained; the awakening power of that sentence which is due to sin, is felt in a state of alienation from God; and as we believe that, 'if one died for all, then were all dead,' so we believe, that he who was crucified, dead, and buried, likewise triumphed over the grave, and now 'sitteth at the right hand of God,' in a glorified body, to make intercession for man; in order that he might effectually purchase, and redeem to himself, a people to the praise of his name; and diffuse throughout his universal empire, a similarity of opinion and nature, arising from the experience of his universal redeeming love.

"I am no Arian—far from it. I believe in the *clear, emphatic testimonies*, laid down in holy writ, that *Christ was more than a prophet*. I repeat my belief, that he suffered, died, ascended, and is now come, 'the second time, without sin unto salvation,' in order to reconcile the world to himself. I know many are willing to admit that he died for all, as all were in a state of death: and that by the imputation of his righteousness, all are justified in the sight of God. Whereas, I think it more just to proceed in the language of the holy, inspired apostle, 'that they which live, should not henceforth live to themselves, but to him who died for them, and rose again;' that there may be an effectual redemption, a thorough change; not the imputation of righteousness *without works*, but a real substantial righteousness, in heart and life; which may operate upon, and regulate the mind and will, and lead us to a conformity to his divine nature: not a righteousness imputed to us, from what Christ did and suffered without us, but a righteousness raised by him within us, through our surrendering ourselves to his government, and yielding entire submission to his heart-cleansing, refining power.

"However this doctrine may relish with some, I am convinced *he died for all*, that all should be saved; that through *him*, we might be *justified* in the sight of God, that we might 'put on the Lord Jesus Christ, with all his divine affections.'" Pages 33, 34, 35, 36. Again in the same sermon, page 41,

“Our sins have been great, and *our transgressions never could have been obliterated, had not Christ done it for us*; let us therefore no longer dwell upon the rock of presumption, with Satan, who hath been a liar from the beginning; but let us rather descend into the valley of humility and peace, and settle accounts with the God of our lives; from whom I had strayed to that degree that my life became a burden to me, and I have wished that I had never been born; but *Christ, who was a friend to the publicans and sinners, is now become the rock of my salvation*; he hath caused me to trust in him, and to seek the Lord my God. The debt I owe is infinite. I desire ever to acknowledge it with all possible gratitude, and to do my utmost towards the discharge of it, while I have my being.”



INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

It is no new thing for the writings of the early Quakers to be mutilated and perverted, in order to prove their denial of the doctrines of our Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles. Among the many accusations and calumnies which were heaped upon this despised people, there was none more frequently reiterated, nor more fully refuted and denied, than this, which the compilers of the pamphlet are now endeavouring to support; and it is a fact, that, in order to sustain it, the enemies of the society have *always* been compelled to resort to garbling or misrepresentation of their language.

It is well known that the fundamental principle of the Society, is a belief in, and an obedience to, the sensible influences of the holy spirit of Christ, in the soul. At the time of its first rise, this important doctrine was too little known or believed in, while great dependence was placed upon the observation of mere outward rites, and a bare historical belief in the life, suffering, and death of Christ; the scriptures being considered as the word of God, and the alone treasury of that knowledge which gives life eternal. Hence it was, that the Society of Friends, strenuously enforced the *necessity* of coming to the real experience of the work of regeneration in the heart; to feel Christ ruling there by his spirit; that so the blessed and most comfortable truths of Holy Scripture might be sealed in their experience, by the revelation of that power which gave the scriptures forth. Now, because Friends preached the necessity of coming to know *Christ within*, they were charged with denying *Christ without*, and with believing in Christ no otherwise than as the spirit in man. And because they taught the necessity of the new birth in the soul, and a real change of heart, whereby all things came to be of God, they were accused of slighting, or wholly denying, the virtue of all that the Son of God had done for them, *without them*.

These several accusations they again and again related; declaring that while they enforced the necessity of the *inward work*, they were so far from *denying the outward*, that they were taught by the Holy Spirit, *most reverently and gratefully to believe and acknowledge all that was done by Jesus Christ without them*; and that although, with the apostle, they believed the spirit of Christ was in all men, who were not reprobates, yet, so far from doubting, they were taught by this very spirit, unfeignedly to believe and own, both the Godhead and manhood of Jesus Christ, his miraculous conception, holy life, miracles, propitiatory sacrifice, death, resurrection, ascension, mediation and intercession; and openly to avow their full faith in all that was contained in the Holy Scriptures of truth.

So repeatedly has the Society declared its belief, in all these doctrines of the Christian religion, that the generality of liberal minded men have been convinced of the soundness of its faith, and of its

consistency with Holy Scripture; and the invidious charge of Socinianism had ceased to be arrayed against them, until renewed by William Craig Brownlee, and his coadjutors, the compilers of the pamphlet which we are replying to. We do not, however, regret the coalition. It is a favourable circumstance that they agree so nearly, in endeavouring to prove the Society "ab origine, Socinian;" since the same reply will serve for both: though, as the most suitable rebuke for their calumny, we would advise them to read the replies to Bugg and Leslie, and the "Switch for the Snake."

It is certainly not consistent with fair dealing, to pass over the many plain and clear declarations of faith, which the Society of Friends have at different times published, with the false assertion that they rejected all creeds and confessions of faith; and to cull from their *controversial writings*, mutilated sentences, and publish them as exhibiting the true doctrines of the society. Controversial writings are more generally written to refute and expose the errors of an opponent, than fully to set forth the belief of the writer. There are some observations in a reply to the "Snake in the Grass," which are so peculiarly applicable to the compilers of the pamphlet, that we shall quote them. They are inserted in Gough's History.

"As to this venomous performance, it was remarked: 1. That the matters therein charged upon us, (Friends,) are generally the same that have been charged on us heretofore, by Faldo, Hicks, and other adversaries, and always refuted, over and over, both formerly and of late. 2. That the things they charge on us, as errors and heresy, are not pretended to be proved, by any plain, express positions or assertions of ours, but from our adversaries' own *perverse meanings and wrested constructions* of our words, always *denied and rejected by us*. 3. That the words and passages brought by our adversaries, for proof of their charges against us, are not taken out of our *doctrinal treatises, or declarations of faith and principles*; but for the most part, out of controversial books, wherein, oftentimes, the scope and aim of the author is not so much to assert, or express, his own principles or doctrines, as to impugn and expose his adversaries; by showing the contradictions, absurdities, and ill consequences of his adversaries' opinions; from whence positively to conclude the author's own judgment, is neither safe nor fair. 4. That, however any of our former adversaries might have been misled in their judgments concerning us, George Keith, who hath now moved this controversy against us, *knows full well, that we do not hold those things, either generally, as a people, or as particular persons, which he has charged on us as errors*." "Besides this, (says Gough,) as George Keith had done before, in his quotations, and references to their writings, he stuck at *no unhandsome nor unfair means* to represent this people in the most ridiculous, absurd, and disadvantageous light. He *mutilated their expressions, by omitting the leading or concluding parts of a sentence, or passing over some in the middle*; whereby, in most cases, they made a *sense quite different from the author's intention*."—Vide *Gough's History*, vol. iii. p. 392, 393, 394.

In order to enable our readers, to compare the sentiments of Elias Hicks, with those of the authors who are quoted in the

following pages, and to give a clear view of the great discrepancy and contradiction between them; we subjoin the following extracts from his letters, sermons, &c. viz:

SENTIMENTS OF ELIAS HICKS.

"I dont admire at the difficulties thou hast had to encounter, in regard to the *mode of redemption, generally held by professing christians*, as being effected by the *death or outward dying of Jesus Christ* upon the outward wooden cross. *This*, as it regards the redemption of the immortal soul from the bondage of sin, *I consider a vulgar error*, that came in with the apostacy from primitive christianity. The redemption effected by *this outward offering*, would ONLY, according to the true analogy of things, be a *redemption of the outward bodies*; for, as under the legal dispensation, there were many legal institutes, that were binding upon the people of Israel, and on no other people, and a breach of these, produced *legal crimes* to which penalties were attached, and these inflicted on the *bodies of the Israelites*; now I consider that the offering of the body of Jesus Christ on the outward cross *applied only as a matter of redemption to the Israelites*; redeeming them from the curse of that covenant and the penalties attendant on every breach thereof, and this outward redemption was the top stone of that figurative dispensation, as by it that dispensation with all its legal rites and ceremonies was abolished and done away."—*Elias Hicks' letter to William B. Irish.*

"Why shouldst thou think it cruel or painful, that God sent his Son into the world, and when in the world, permitted him to suffer death by the hands of wicked men, when history informs us that many thousands of righteous men and women have, by the permission of the Almighty, been persecuted to death by wicked men; yet, nevertheless, we do not believe that God sent any of these into the world purposely to suffer death, in the cruel way they did, by the cruel power of the wicked; *neith r do I believe that God sent Jesus Christ into the world purposely to suffer death in the way he did, any more than all them*; for *I do not believe that God created any rational being and sent him into the world, to suffer death for other men*; because they were wicked and he was righteous; but that it was the righteousness of all these that aggravated the wicked, and was the procuring cause of their hatred and vengeance toward them when they cruelly persecuted them to death. But their sufferings was entirely opposite to, and inconsistent with, the purpose and will of God, for if it was not, the perpetrators of these dreadful crimes, and most atrocious deeds, would all stand justified in his sight."—*Ibid.*

"Hence we conclude, that *God never sent his Son, Jesus Christ, nor any of his rational creation, purposely into the world to suffer death*, by cruel men, *but only in his free and voluntary choice to attend to and do his holy will in all things, and thereby glorify and enjoy him, which all agree to be the chief end and design of man's creation.*"—*Ibid.*

"But as divine wisdom foresaw that his people Israel, would revolt from his commandments, and rebel against his law, and become cruel and hard hearted, so likewise he foresaw that the wicked among

them would cruelly *persecute and slay many of the righteous*; and his son, Jesus Christ, *among the rest*, therefore he inspired many of his servants to testify of *these things* among them, before they came to pass—as a *warning and caution*, that so those who were seeking after the right way, might be preserved from taking any part therein; while those who wilfully hardened their hearts against reproof, might suffer the penalties resulting from their crimes, which they had committed in their own free choice, contrary to the counsel and will of their Creator.”—*Ibid.*

In an essay entitled “Wisdom Justified of all her Children,” after speaking of Christ as the Jewish Messiah, in which capacity he fulfilled the law and did it away, which was the first part of his work, &c. he proceeds:—

“And, secondly, after having finished the law, John’s water Baptism being the last ritual he had to conform to, *after which he immediately received the descending of the Holy Spirit of God upon him*, agreeably to the above Prophecy of Isaiah; *by which he became a partaker of the divine nature of his Heavenly Father, and by this spiritual birth, became the son of God, with power*; and thereby fully qualified for his Gospel Mission, and went forth, clothed with the spirit and power of God, preaching the gospel to the poor.

“Hence, we see another instance of the consummate wisdom of the Highest, in leading his beloved son, *qualified only as a real and true Israelite*, first to fulfil in that state all the righteousness of the law, *before the pouring forth of the Holy Spirit upon him*, which is the peculiar privilege of the gospel state, but which no individual is prepared to receive, until, like Jesus, he has fulfilled all the righteousness of the moral law. For, had his *diffusion of the spirit been conferred upon him while engaged in the fulfilment of that outward covenant*, he would not have been any example to that people; as it would have proved that it required greater ability than the Israelites had received, to perform the same; and would thereby impeach the Lord of being an hard master, in requiring more than he had given ability to perform. But, by *withholding the diffusion of the spirit*, until he had fulfilled the law of the outward covenant, *with the same ability that every Israelite had conferred upon him for the same purpose*; he thereby justifies his heavenly Father, and proves his impartiality towards the children of men, and stands as a perfect example in that relation, to all succeeding ages, who come to the knowledge of it. And then by the pouring forth of his spirit upon him, shows his readiness *to do the same to every other of his rational creation*, according to their several needs, to enable them to fulfil, as Jesus has done, all the righteousness of the gospel—who had previously come up in the same way of faithfulness, in fulfilling the righteousness of the law. And when he had finished his *outward ministration*, he then gave himself up to the power of his enemies; although it was a very severe and trying baptism for his human nature to bear; having a clear prospect of his sufferings and death, *crying out that the spirit was willing, but the flesh was weak*: but by his willing surrender to his heavenly Father’s will, he has set as a perfect example that we should account nothing too dear, not

even our bodily lives, to surrender for the gospel sake, and the testimony of a good conscience."—*Wisdom Justified.*

"First, By what means did Jesus suffer? The answer is plain, by the hands of wicked men, and because his works were righteous, and theirs were wicked. Query. Did God send him into the world, purposely to suffer death by the hands of wicked men? By no means, *but to live a righteous and godly life, (which was the design and end of God's creating man in the beginning,)* and thereby be a perfect example to such of mankind as should come to the knowledge of him and of his perfect life. For if it was the purpose and will of God, that he should die by the hands of wicked men, then the Jews, by crucifying him, would have done God's will, and of course would all have stood justified in his sight, which could not be. But it was permitted so to be, as *it had been* with many of *the prophets, and wise and good men* that were before him, who suffered death by the hands of wicked men for righteousness sake, *as ensamples* to those that came after, that they should account nothing too dear to give up for the truth's sake, not even their own lives."—*Letter to Dr. N. Shoemaker.*

"But I DO NOT CONSIDER THAT THE CRUCIFIXION OF THE OUTWARD BODY OF FLESH AND BLOOD OF JESUS ON THE CROSS, WAS AN ATONEMENT FOR ANY SINS BUT THE LEGAL SINS OF THE JEWS; for as their law was outward, so their legal sins and their penalties were outward, and these could be atoned for by an outward sacrifice; and this last outward sacrifice was a full *type* of the inward sacrifice that every sinner must make, in giving up that sinful life of his own will, in and by which he hath from time to time crucified the innocent life of God in his own soul, and which Paul calls, the old man with his deeds, or the man of sin and son of perdition, who hath taken God's seat in the heart, and there exalteth itself above all that is called God or is worshipped, sitting as judge and supreme. Now all this life, power, and will of man, must be slain and die on the cross spiritually, as Jesus died on the cross outwardly, and this *is the true atonement*, which that outward atonement was a clear and full *type* of. This the apostle Paul sets forth in a plain manner. Romans, vi. 3, 4. Know ye not that so many of us as were baptised into Jesus Christ, were baptised into his death? Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead, (outwardly,) by the glory of the Father, even so we, having by the spiritual baptism witnessed a death to sin shall know a being raised up spiritually and walk in newness of life."—*Ibid.*

"And inasmuch as those idle promulgators of original sin, believe they are made sinners, without their consent or knowledge, which, according to the nature and reason of things, every rational mind must see is impossible; so likewise, they are *idle and ignorant* enough to believe they are made righteous without their consent or knowledge, *by the righteousness of one* who lived on the earth near two thousand years before they had an existence; and this by the cruel hands of wicked men, slaying an innocent and righteous one; and these are bold and daring enough, to lay this cruel and unholy act in the charge of divine justice as having purposely ordained it to be so: but what an outrage it is against every righteous law of God

and man, as the scriptures abundantly testify. See Exod. ch. 23, v. 7. "Keep thee far from a false matter, and the innocent and righteous slay thou not, for I will not justify the wicked." Deut. 27 ch. 25 v. "Cursed be he that taketh reward, to slay an innocent person;" and much more might be produced to show the *wickedness and absurdity of the doctrine*, that would accuse the perfectly just all-wise and merciful Jehovah of so barbarous and cruel an act as that of slaying his innocent and righteous son, to *atone* for the sins and iniquities of the ungodly.

"Surely is it possible that any rational being, that has any right sense of justice or mercy, that would be willing to accept forgiveness of his sins, on such terms! Would he not rather go forward and offer himself wholly up, to suffer all the penalties due to his crimes, rather than the innocent should suffer? Nay, was he so hardly, as to acknowledge a willingness to be saved through such a medium, would it not prove, that he stood in direct opposition, to every principle of justice and honesty, of mercy and love, and show himself to be a poor, selfish creature, and unworthy of notice!" Ibid.

Elias Hicks, in his letter to Thomas Willis, on the miraculous conception of the Lord Jesus Christ, says:

"Finding this to be the case, I examined the accounts given on this subject, by the four Evangelists, and according to my best judgment on the occasion, I was led to think there was considerable more scripture evidence for his being the son of Joseph than otherwise; although it has not yet changed my belief, are the consequences which follow much more favourable; for as the Israelitish covenant rested very much upon external evidence by way of outward miracle, so I conceive this miraculous birth was intended principally to induce the Israelites to believe he was their promised Messiah, or the great prophet, Moses had long before prophesied of, that should come, like unto himself.

"But, when we consider that he was born of a woman that was joined in lawful wedlock with a man of Israel, it would seem that it must shut the way to the enforcing any such belief, as all their neighbours would naturally be led to consider him the son of Joseph, and this it appears very clear they did, by the scripture testimony: and although it has not, as above observed, given cause as yet, to alter my views on the subject, as tradition is a mighty bulwark, not easily removed, yet it has had this salutary effect, to deliver me from judging my brethren and fellow creatures who are in that belief, and can feel the same flow of love and unity with them, as though they were in the same belief with myself; neither would I dare to say, positively, that it would be my mind, they should change their belief, unless I could give them much greater evidence than I am at present possessed of, as I consider in regard to our salvation, they are both non-essentials; and I may further say, that I believe it would be much greater sin in me, to smoke tobacco that was the produce of the labour of slaves, than it would be to believe either of these positions;"—See Letter to T. Willis.

"I admit that I did assert, and have long done it, that we cannot

believe what we do not understand; this the scripture affirms; Deut. xxix. 29. 'The secret things belong unto the Lord our God, but the things that are revealed belong unto us, and our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law;' and all that is not revealed is to us the same as a nonentity, and will forever remain so, until it is revealed; and that which is revealed enables us, agreeably to the apostle's exhortation, to give a reason of the hope that is in us, to honest inquirers."—*E. Hicks' Letter to Dr. E. A. Atlee.*

"As to what she [Anna Braithwaite,] relates as it regards the manner of our coming into the world in our infant state, it is my belief that we come into the world in the same state of innocence, and endowed with the same propensities and desires, that our first parents were, in their primeval state; and this Jesus Christ has established, and must be conclusive in the minds of all true believers, when he took a little child in his arms, and blessed him, and said to them around him, that except they were converted, and became as that little child, they should in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven. Of course, *all the desires and propensities* of that little child, and of our first parents, in their primeval state, must have been good, as they were all the endowments of their Creator, and given to them for a special and useful purpose. But it is the improper and unlawful indulgence of them that is evil."

"I readily acknowledge I have not been able to see or understand how the cruel persecution and crucifixion of Jesus Christ, by the wicked and hard hearted Jews, should expiate my sins; and *I never have known any thing to effect that for me*, but the grace of God, that taught me, agreeably to the apostle's doctrine, to deny all ungodliness and the world's lusts, and to live soberly, righteously and godly, in this present world; and as I have faithfully abode under its teachings, in full obedience thereto, I have been brought to believe that my sins were forgiven, and I permitted to sit under the Lord's teaching, as saith the prophet, that the children of the Lord are all taught of the Lord, and in righteousness they are established, and great is the peace of his children. And so long as I feel this peace, there is nothing in this world that makes me afraid, as it respects my eternal condition. But if any of my friends have received *any known benefit from any outward sacrifice*, I do not envy them their privileges. But surely they would not be willing that I should acknowledge, *as a truth, that which I have no kind of knowledge of?*"
—*Ibid.*

We shall now quote some extracts from Elias Hicks' sermons, recently delivered in the city of Philadelphia, and the neighbouring counties, which will be found to correspond with the sentiments expressed in his letters.

Sermon I. at Arch street, pages 10, 11. Speaking of Christ, he said, "Who was his father? He was begotten of God. *We cannot suppose that it was the outward body of flesh and blood that was begotten of God*, but a birth of the spiritual life in the soul. We must apply it *internally and spiritually*. For *nothing can be a son of God, but that which is spirit*: and nothing but the soul of man is a recipient for the light and spirit of God. Therefore, *nothing can be*

a son of God but that which is immortal and invisible. Nothing visible can be a son of God. Every visible thing must come to an end, and we must know the mortality of it. Flesh and blood cannot enter into Heaven. By the analogy of reason, spirit cannot beget a material body, because the thing begotten must be of the same nature with its father. Spirit cannot beget any thing but spirit; it cannot beget flesh and blood. No, my friends, it is impossible."

Sermon III. Western District, Twelfth street, pages 50, 51.—
 "We must never look for the way without us; 'I am the way, the truth, and the life,' Jesus declared, when he was outwardly present as a teacher and Messiah to Israel. They did not look any higher. He was their director, *their Saviour*. He it was that *saved them from their outward sicknesses*. He was only an *outward Saviour*, that healed their *outward diseases*, and gave them *strength of body* to enjoy that *outward good land*. This was a *figure of the great comforter*, which he would pray the Father to send them; an inward one, that would heal all the diseases of their souls, and cleanse them all from their inward pollutions; that thing of God; that thing of eternal life. It was the soul that wanted salvation; but this *no outward Saviour* could do; no external Saviour *could have any hand in it*. It was altogether inward, for as God is a spirit, invisible to all our external senses, he is incomprehensible to all rational creatures. The work must be by some secret thing in the soul, and every one to whom it is communicated has a soul in which it dwells."

Sermon IX. Middletown. "As man gains honour by victories in worldly things, so we may consider it in a religious sense. When we meet with that which would lead us from the divine law, instituted by perfect wisdom; if we meet it with firmness, and stand our ground against all the allurements to vice and temptation to evil, we come to be in a degree like our great pattern, *who rose up to a situation fit to be a communicant* with the great Creator in the realms of eternal happiness."—Pages 231, 232.

Sermon X. Falls. "This animal body of Jesus Christ, was born of the Virgin Mary, and therefore must be nothing, as to the visible part, but flesh and blood; as nothing else could emanate from her but what was of her. So here, now, this outward body, this flesh and blood, was born of a woman, which shows us why Jesus always calls himself the son of man—because he was verily and actually so, for he could not use evasions. Now, I have heard suggestions from rational beings, that Jesus mentioned this, to deceive the people; to turn them away; to make them believe something that was not correct; that it was only a speech that did not apply to him. But it was the truth, for he could speak nothing but the truth, and he knew, with a full certainty, that he was the son of man, as well as any of us can know so; and therefore he asserted it abundantly. And the highest station he assumed, while in that prepared body, was, that he was not only the son of man, but the son of God. Here, now, we learn, as rational beings, by his own testimony, what it is that makes a son of God. We see that this flesh and blood never could have been in a strict sense the son of God, but a creature created by God, by his power, *because spirit and matter cannot be united to-*

gether, and make a being, nor make a son of God. Nothing but the rational souls of men and women can come to know a birth of God and the rational soul never was created by flesh, or through flesh. The animal part is taken, and created flesh, by the power of God."

In the same sermon, speaking of "the life which was the light of men," he says, "Here now are we all to have a portion of the same light, for the life was the light of men, and it remains eternally so. It all comes from God, and is dispensed to the children of men, and it was to *Jesus Christ likewise, as man, in the same proportion* as to inscrutable wisdom seemed necessary and consistent, to effect the great design in the creation and redemption of the children of men."

So here we see Jesus made lower than the angels, on account of his suffering death. He was tempted in all points, as we are. Now, how could he be tempted, *if he had been fixed in a state of perfection in which he could not turn aside?* Can you suppose, as rational beings, that such a being could be tempted? No, not any more than God Almighty could be tempted. *Perfection is perfection, and cannot be tempted.* It is impossible: and here it is proved to a demonstration, that *he came to be an example* to the children of men; a great high priest and teacher in those things which concern the salvation of the children of men. And here he did his office, as a great high priest of the Jewish covenant, in that outward dispensation, in which he was limited to the Jewish people as a child of Abraham; to sum up all the righteousness of the law; by faithfulness to it: and when he had effected that part, *by the grace of God* that was upon him, for we read that he grew in stature and in favour with God and man; and the grace of God was upon him. Then *it was not his grace, but the grace of God, communicated to him, as it was communicated to the rest of Abraham's children;* to every one in a sufficient degree to enable them to come up to the law and commandments given them. It will not do for us to suppose, for a moment, that the Almighty, when he gave this law, did not at the same time give them power to fulfil it in all its parts. For if he did not, they could not be accountable for a neglect. But we see that he did this, for here was a child of Abraham, *endued with his spirit, which he has given to every rational creature to profit with.* He lived up to the law and covenant given by the Father, and in this he justified his heavenly Father in giving this law and covenant, and thereby condemned the Israelites for not fulfilling it. Well, when he had done this, for we hear of *no miracles till after all this was done, none at all; nor any thing of his righteousness or acts;* but now, when he went into the last institute of the legal dispensation, which was called watery baptism, and the ministry of John, his forerunner, was nearly at an end, divine wisdom thought fit to reveal to John, by what medium he should know who it was that was to baptize with the Holy Ghost. It was him on whom the spirit should be seen descending and resting upon him.

"Now, we find, that when he came up out of the water, John having baptized him, the Holy Ghost descended in bodily shape like a dove, and rested upon him. Now, whether this was open to John's

external eye, or whether it might not rather be an expression of John's, that as the dove is the most innocent creature of the feathered race, he made use of it, to express what he beheld in him, and in this power that descended upon him. This was a power from heaven—an *additional* power and gift from heaven; as by his righteousness in fulfilling the law, he was prepared to enter into a *higher* dispensation.

“I consider, according to the tenor of the law, that the whole design was to lead up some of the Israelites into this state of perfection, and fulfilment of the law; and then that it should be abolished. Hence, the fulfilment of the law was the abolishment of the law. He abolished it by nailing it to his cross. Oh! had the professors of Christianity left it there, and been willing to go forward, under the illumination of the Holy Ghost, which alone could qualify Jesus to be a gospel minister; so likewise, according to his own testimony, nothing ever did or can qualify for the ministry, but the descending of the Holy Ghost from heaven, upon rational creatures. And, therefore, in the same proportion as we have the descending of the holy spirit upon us, in the same proportion, till we gain a conquest over our passions and propensities, we shall be *more tempted and tried*. So it was with Jesus, when this holy spirit descended upon him, the spirit drove him into the wilderness to be tempted of Satan.

“Now, let us pause a little, and consider what is here meant. Can it be supposed that he was driven into an *outward* wilderness? Or shall we not suppose, that he was brought, by the power of divine light, to see the *wilderness state in his own mind*? Because, in the outward wilderness a man loses his way, and meets with many trials; and so there is a spiritual wilderness, where man is tempted and tried. Here the natural propensities which are fixed in man, no doubt for an excellent purpose, rise up and attempt to gain an ascendancy over us. Here we find it in all things in us. The propensity to thirst—what does it do? It is a gift of God to the children of men. It leads them to do that which might sustain their natural life. But if not regulated and kept under subjection by the immortal soul, which is placed in us to regulate these animal desires and propensities, it will become injurious to us, by being indulged to excess. For you know we have many propensities; many that are necessary to us: for we could not eat or drink, or have a desire to do it, if we had not a propensity to it. We could not fulfil the command, to increase and multiply, and replenish the earth, had we not a desire which led to it. These propensities are all good in their place; and we could not answer the end of our creation without them. As it is not in bones to think, or flesh to reason, so there is no bounds to our natural desires: but the soul must wait for counsel from on high, and direct the body, and by faithfulness to it, regulate all these desires, and keep them within the bounds of reason and truth. This was the case with the blessed Jesus, so that he never offended in any one point; but learnt obedience by the things he suffered. *He had all these desires. The desire after knowledge, and the things of the world, presented itself to his animal part; and thus it is said to have driven him into the wilderness: that is, he felt that wilderness*

which man feels, while in a state of probation. It is the way in which divine wisdom speaks of the church. ‘I will allure her, and draw her into the wilderness, and speak comfortably unto her.’ I will allure her—see, I will draw her. Now what wilderness was this? It was not an outward wilderness; but the same which Jesus was led up into: and here it was that he was tried. Here the tempter *led him up to aspire after the glory of the world*. He told him if he would fall down and worship him, that he could arrive at it—if he would only submit to this desire, and fall down and worship it, all should be his: but you see how ready he was to reply to this temptation. The divine law always gives us an answer, and if we are faithful, *we shall be like Jesus*; when we are tempted to aspire after the glories of the world. We shall be always able to give a righteous answer, if we are faithful to the truth in our own minds, *as fully as he was*, no doubt; because he is our example, and we are to follow his steps. Jesus said, ‘Get thee behind me, satan.’ Oh! how often has my poor soul been brought to this point, when temptations have arisen, ‘Get thee behind me, satan.’ Oh! I have seen that it was mine enemy; the light of truth has revealed it to me; and I have felt sometimes, in a degree, like the blessed Jesus. I have seen that mine enemy hath wanted to exalt me: but I could ask no honour or power, for I knew that he had none to give, nor any power to preserve me one moment.

“Get thee behind me, satan: for it is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.’ Is not this the case with all of us? Have we not this language in our souls; that sometimes tells us it is not right to serve any thing else in this world. Here, if we are faithful to the divine light, we shall in proportion be able to withstand every temptation that may assail us in our state of wilderness, travel, and probation.

“We read that he was taken up and set upon a pinnacle of the temple. And do you suppose there was some power which actually took him up, and set him upon a pinnacle? No, I hope there are none so ignorant as to suppose so. It was a *temptation to exalt himself, for his righteousness—his goodness*. And have you not, many of you, been set upon this pinnacle of high honour? Have *you not a little religious pride*? What was that saying then to the tempter? He was placed in a *dangerous* situation; but not more so than the soul is when tempted to aspire in consequence of its righteousness. The tempter ‘saith unto him, if thou be the son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, he shall give his angels charge concerning thee; and in their hands shall they bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.’” Pages 252 to 259.

Sermon XI. Trenton. Page 292. “If we believe that God is equal and righteous in all his ways; that he has made of one blood all the families that dwell upon the earth, it is impossible that he should be partial; and therefore, he has been as willing to reveal his will to every creature, as he was to our first parents, to Moses and the prophets, to JESUS CHRIST, and his apostles. He never can *set ANY of these above us*, because, if he did, he would be partial. His love is the same for all, and as no man can save his brother, or give

a ransom for his soul, therefore the Almighty must be the only deliverer of his people."

Sermon V. Germantown. "All must go away. We must *no longer look to the letter, let it come from what source it may, it is no difference*. He directed them to wait for the spirit. 'I will pray the Father, and he will send you another comforter;' another than the letter, and different from any that you ever heard verbally *from me*, or from men; for it is *all but letter*; all that can come to you through your external senses. But the will of God manifested within us never can come through the external senses, it must come through the spiritual senses: and then it will quicken the soul, open the blind eye and deaf ear of the soul, so that it can see and hear the things of God clearly. The time has come, I believe, when it is necessary to give up all our old foundations, and suffer them, my friends, to pass under judgment, that judgment may pass upon all, and that this truth may be revealed. It is expedient that I go away: for if I go not away the Comforter will not come, but if I go away I will pray the Father, and he will send you another Comforter? Another, in what respect? A spiritual one disencumbered with any thing corporal; *entirely spiritual and nothing else*. Why?—Because the soul of man is purely spiritual, and nothing can have communion with the Father but that which is spiritual, an immortal soul. *Every thing then derived from the letter, must come through the external senses, and can only answer for the outward creature*: but when the spiritual senses are quickened by the coming in of the spirit of God, and the shining of his light upon the soul, it opens a renewed intercourse with his creature man, as he did with our first parents in the beginning in Eden's garden." Pages 112, 113.

Same sermon, page 119. "We have a gracious God to do with, who is able to give all that is necessary. If the Scriptures were absolutely necessary, he had power to communicate them to all the nations of the earth. For he has his way as a path in the clouds; he knows how to deal out to all his rational children. But they were not necessary, and perhaps *not suited to any other people than they to whom they were written*. Is it to be supposed that he has neglected any nation? Can we suppose that he has forgotten the rest of the nations of the earth? No, he has dispensed a suitable law, to answer every purpose, as completely as the law to the Israelites answered for them; for otherwise he is a partial God.

Sermon VI. Abington. "The New Testament so called, which is usually bound up in the book called the Bible, *comprehends no covenant; there is nothing in it that appertains to a covenant*. It consists chiefly and principally in a biographical account of the birth, the miracles, and the excellent life of Jesus Christ, the son of Mary, and of the epistles and writings of his apostles. But the covenant made with Israel, as comprehended in what is called the Old Testament, was a real covenant, and was bound in a very solemn manner, and had its witnesses." Page 124.

Sermon VII. page 163. "Nothing can write God's law upon our hearts but the finger of God. There it is, then, that we must gather, as the only place of safety; there the work is to be

done. It is there, we find our enemy, if we have any, and there we must find our friend. But people are too generally looking outward to find God; and in this outward looking, they are told about a devil; some monstrous creature, some self-existing creature, that is terrible in power. Now all this seeking to know God, and this devil or the serpent without, is the work of darkness, superstition, and tradition. It hath no foundation; it is all breath and wind, without the power. We need not look without for enemies or friends, for we shall not find them without. Our enemies are those of our own household, our own propensities and unruly desires, are our greatest, and I may almost say, our alone enemies."

Sermon XI. Trenton, 293. "There is nothing can give us faith but God. Faith is the gift of God. But this faith in creeds and the traditions of our fathers, what is it? It is worse than nothing. We had better have no faith at all. It is no better than the faith of devils. Thou believest that there is one God; thou dost well: the devils also, believe and tremble." Who are the devils?—Apostate men and women, who go contrary to God. They are all devils. Every thing that is in opposition to the will of God is a devil. In short, *they are nothing* but what opposes the law of light and the spirit of truth in the heart; *nothing* but what is in opposition to the law of God; and that devil is in us all; *as sure as the kingdom of God is in us, so sure the devil is in us*. Were you ever tempted by any devil but one in your own souls? No: you never were.—There it is that we come to know God, and no where else. It is the only place where he is manifested."

Such are the absurd, inconsistent, and antichristian sentiments of Elias Hicks; and *to support these*, the compilers of the pamphlet have adduced their quotations from the writings of primitive Friends. It being fully proved, and well known, that not only Elias Hicks, but many of his adherents, do openly and publicly deny the miraculous conception, divinity, and atonement of Christ, and the authenticity, and divine authority of Holy Scripture; and the compilers having made their extracts purposely to prove that our early Friends were coincident in their faith; we consider, that the publication of the pamphlet, is, undeniably, a renewal of the often refuted charge against the Society, of denying the doctrines of the christian religion.

Note.—The limits of this work will not admit of extending our quotations from the Sermons to great length. We can embrace *but few* of the objectionable sentiments with which the *whole volume* is replete. Those we *have* quoted, are amply sufficient to show the *striking contrast* between the christian doctrines of the Quakers, and the notions of Elias Hicks. The books from which we have made our extracts are easily accessible to all, and we respectfully recommend those persons who read them, to compare the sentiments they contain, with those asserted by "primitive Friends," in the extracts given in the following pages.



A VINDICATION OF THE QUAKERS, &c.

CHAPTER I.

Defence of William Penn, from the charges of denying the Three that bear record in Heaven—the Godhead of Jesus Christ—his Propitiatory Sacrifice, and the Authenticity of Holy Scripture, &c.

SECTION I.

OF THE “SANDY FOUNDATION SHAKEN.”

IN the year 1666, William Penn was convinced of the truth of the principles held by the Society of Friends, and joined himself to their religious communion. Possessing an active and uncommonly vigorous mind, cultivated by a liberal education, and disciplined in the school of Christ, he was eminently qualified for promulgating, and successfully defending, the doctrines of the christian religion. The seventeenth century is known to have been remarkable for the dissensions which existed in England, among the different denominations of religious professors. Publick disputes upon the subject of christian faith, were very common, and it too frequently happened, that they were managed without due regard to that divine charity which is pure, gentle, and easy to be entreated. An extraordinary degree of interest seemed to be awakened in many persons, relative to the important concerns of the soul's salvation, and many were seeking after the knowledge of the truth, with hearts humbly disposed to embrace it, in full faith.

The religious Society of Friends, then in its very infancy, had rapidly increased in numbers; and as its doctrines were but little understood, and often misrepresented; its members were frequently engaged, publickly to defend themselves from the aspersions of their enemies. Hence, they were often involved in disputations, in the management of which, as well as in their controversial writings, they used expressions which may sound harsh to modern ears; great allowance, however, is certainly to be made for the improvement in language, and the refinement in taste and manners since their day.

It was not to be supposed, that a mind like Penn's would long remain an idle spectator of the commotions which prevailed among his

fellow professors of the christian name. Called of God to the ministry of the gospel, animated by an ardent desire for the good of souls, he soon became a zealous preacher of the religion of Jesus Christ; and very early in life, was engaged publickly to defend the Society, against the calumny of its accusers.

Two of the hearers of one Thomas Vincent, a presbyter in the Spittle Yard, London, having gone over to the Quakers, their former pastor took offence thereat, and charged the Society, with holding "the most erroneous and damnable doctrines." It was not long before Penn heard of this, and in conjunction with his intimate friend, George Whitehead, demanded an opportunity of publickly vindicating their injured christian reputation. A conference accordingly took place, in which several points of faith were discussed, somewhat at length, but nothing finally concluded upon. William Penn finding that they were not likely to be fairly or decently heard, determined upon stating the grounds of the controversy between them and Vincent, in another manner; and with this view, wrote his treatise entitled "The Sandy Foundation Shaken, &c.;" which was published in 1668, within two years after he had joined the Society of Friends, and when he was only in the twenty-fourth year of his age.

No sooner was this work published, than William Penn was accused of being a Socinian, denying the divinity of Christ, &c. and committed close prisoner to the Tower; and it is somewhat surprising, that notwithstanding he has often denied and repelled the charge, yet, to this day, the Sandy Foundation is adduced to prove him a Socinian. The compilers of the pamphlet are not the first who have quoted this book of William Penn's, to sanction their apostasy from the christian doctrines of the Quakers. About the year 1801, Hannah Barnard, a minister of the Society of Friends, being then in England, on a religious errand, adopted notions somewhat similar, though far more rational and consistent, than those now promulgated by Elias Hicks; and was disowned from the Society therefor. A writer under the name of "Verax," undertook the defence of her doctrines, and published a work to show their consistency with those of primitive Friends; asserting that they were all Socinians; and among the authorities which he quoted to confirm this, he placed particular stress upon Penn's Sandy Foundation Shaken. He was ably refuted by John Bevans, and the doctrines of the early Quakers proved to be scriptural, in a work known under the title of "Bevans' defence of the Society of Friends." Notwithstanding this refutation, the compilers now present us with a new edition of a part of the Sandy Foundation Shaken, as authority for Elias Hicks' denial of the divinity and atonement of Jesus Christ.

Such a construction of William Penn's argument, can only proceed from ignorance or wilful perversion; since it is obvious, from his own statement of the dispute, that neither of the above articles of faith, were discussed in the conference with Thomas Vincent, nor treated of by Penn in his book. The title page alone, is sufficient evidence of this assertion—it runs thus, "The Sandy Foundation Shaken; or those so generally believed and applauded doctrines, of

One God, subsisting in THREE DISTINCT AND SEPARATE PERSONS; the impossibility of God's pardoning sinners, without a *plenary satisfaction*; and the justification of *impure persons*, by an imputative righteousness; refuted from the authority of scripture testimonies, and right reason."

In stating the argument in relation to the Trinity, William Penn says: "The question was this, Whether we owned *One Godhead*, subsisting in *three distinct and separate persons*," &c.; and lest in treating upon the subject, he should have used any expression, which might be considered as a denial of the scripture doctrine of the "Three that bear record in Heaven;" he very prudently guards the reader against such a misconstruction of his meaning, by this caution, "*Mistake me not, we never have disowned a Father, Word and Spirit, which are One; but men's inventions.*"

Besides the clear testimony of William Penn, on this subject, we have the collateral evidence of his companion, George Whitehead. It appears that Thomas Vincent, their opponent, put the same construction upon Penn's language as our compilers *now do*, and charged him with a denial of the doctrines of the christian religion. To defend Penn and himself *against* this illiberal opinion, George Whitehead wrote and published a book in 1699, which he entitled, "The Divinity of Christ and Unity of the Three that bear record in Heaven; with the blessed end, and effects, of Christ's appearance, coming in the flesh, suffering, and sacrifice for sinners, confessed and vindicated by his followers, called Quakers."*

In this treatise, he states the objection made by William Mad-dox, one of Thomas Vincent's coadjutors, as follows: "You, by refusing to call them the three divine Hees, have made it manifest, that your quarrel is not with the word "person," as some then apprehended; but with the doctrine, or fundamental truth expressed by the three persons, viz: the modal distinction, and essential union, or oneness of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost:" To which George Whitehead answers—"It is manifest that some of the hearers, that were present at our debating this matter, had a better apprehension and understanding of us, than you prejudiced opposers had: for some of them apprehended, that we opposed *your unscriptural terms*; and words put upon the Deity, and *not that we opposed either the Divinity, or Union of Father, Son, or Holy Ghost*; neither did we in the least, go to quarrel with any fundamental truth. Yea, and it was evident to many, that we found fault, with your miscalling and misrepresenting the Father, the Word and Spirit; and *never in the least opposed, nor questioned their being Three such as mentioned in the scripture*; to wit, The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but there openly confessed to the fundamental truth of them, in scripture terms." p. 23.

Again—"And as for his (T. Vincent's) railing against William Penn, and accusing him, with denying that the Lord Jesus Christ is God, and of denying the Divinity of Christ, and Holy Ghost; and with thrusting the Lord Jesus Christ off, from the throne of his God-

* See "Bevans' defence of Friends," pages 38, 39, 40, 41.

head, &c. I have not yet perceived any strength, or weight of argument, from either T. Vincent, or his brethren, that has convicted William Penn as guilty herein; his showing the absurdity of T. Vincent's doctrines, and both unscriptural and unreasonable distinctions, and his denial thereof; is neither a denial of the Son, nor Spirit, nor the divinity of either: but the apparent falseness of these railing accusations, with the consequences thereof, against William Penn in this thing, touching the divinity of Christ, &c. appears in his [William Penn's] own book, (viz. Sandy Foundation, &c.) p. 14. "Of Christ being the only God, and the divine nature being inseparable to each, (whom they call) person; each person having the whole divine nature, the Son in the Father, and the Spirit in the Son, unless the Godhead be as incommunicable to the person (so called), as they are reported to be among themselves," saith William Penn. Doth not William Penn herein, own the divinity of Christ, and Holy Spirit? Let the indifferent judge how T. Vincent hath wronged him; and then William Penn's admonition, page 15, saith; "Apply thy mind unto the light and grace, which brings salvation, that by obedience thereunto, those mists, tradition hath cast before thy eyes, may be expelled, and thou receive a certain knowledge of that one God, whom to know is life eternal, not to be divided, but One pure, entire and eternal Being; who, in the fulness of time, sent forth his Son, as the true light, which enlighteneth every man, that whosoever followed him (the light), might be translated from the dark notions, and vain conversations of men, to this holy light, in which only sound judgment and eternal life are obtainable; he [Christ Jesus] testified the virtue of it, and has communicated unto all, *such a proportion* as may enable them to follow his example."— [Thus far William Penn.] "Now mark, whether herein he has not owned the divinity of the Son, when thus plainly he hath confessed to his light, both as to its extent and virtue."

George Whitehead then complains of T. Vincent's falsely comparing William Penn to Arius, and thus proceeds—"But further, how evidently has William Penn, in his 18, 19, 21 pages, owned and confessed Christ, the Son of God, and his light and grace, both for *remission of sins*, reconciliation, salvation of men, life eternal, and as he is the *only begotten of the Father*, the gift and expression of eternal love, for salvation. Now can any thing have, or work, these effects, that is not divine? Is not Christ's divinity, virtue, divine light, and power, plainly confessed by William Penn herein, as also to his being God, page 21. How grossly have these Presbyterians wronged him, in charging the contrary upon him; and are not *they* rather justly chargeable herein, with denying the divinity of Christ, in setting so slight, by his light in every man, as they have done; one calling it an idol, another cautioning not to follow its guidance—but *the divinity of Christ, and the honour due to him, far be it from us to deny*, as these men have done: and the scripture instances in that case, we both know and own. John iii. 13, viii. 58. Rom. ix. 5. Phil. ii. 6, 10. Coloss. i. 16, 17. Heb. i. 3, 8."

In reply to the charge of Socinianism, George Whitehead remarks, "I have heard of some, beyond the sea, that went under that

name, Socinians; who were accused with denying the divinity of Christ; but I know of none here, that either deny the divinity of Christ, or him to be of one substance with the Father; if our opposers do know of any such, they may tell *them* of it, and not *accuse the innocent with the guilty, as they have done to us.* We had not our principles either from Arius or Socinus, neither *did we ever deny the divinity of Christ,* or his being of the same substance with the Father, as Arius, Socinus, and others are accused; so that therein we are very unjustly compared and misrepresented, for which I can say, the Lord forgive these our prejudiced opposers. But it is no strange thing for us to be called by nicknames, by these and such false accusers; for one while, they were wont to revile us for wanting learning, being illiterate, &c. another while, they accused us falsely, with being Free-Willers, Arminians, &c. because we plead for the free grace of God, to all men; and now *we are falsely reckoned Socinians, and most injuriously accused with denying the divinity of Christ,* the Son of God, which we are *ever always clear of; still confessing him, according to the Scripture, both in his sufferings, dominion, and glory, who is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.*" — *Whitehead's Divinity of Christ,* pages 32, 33, 34, 38, 39. — *Evans' Defence,* page 41.

Now, it must certainly be admitted, that one who was so intimately acquainted with William Penn; who was associated with him in the dispute with Thomas Vincent; and who had heard William Penn himself, declare his sentiments upon these important doctrines then discussed; must be a more competent, and credible witness, of the real belief of this worthy man, than our modern compilers, or any of those who unite with them in accusing William Penn of denying the divinity and atonement of Jesus Christ.

Francis Bugg, who used great exertions to injure the character of the early Friends, appears to have coincided with the compilers, in their construction of William Penn's argument. He publicly charged him with unbelief, in his libellous treatise, entitled "Quakerism Drooping;" to which Richard Claridge, "a learned and highly esteemed writer" in the Society of Friends, thus replies, in "An Essay on the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction, &c."

"That which William Penn related, was not the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as it is declared of in the Scriptures of truth; but the notion of *three distinct and separate persons,* as the title page plainly shows; or *the trinity of distinct and separate persons in the unity of essence,* page 12. *The imagined trinity,* page 16. For *William Penn sincerely owned, and doth own, the Scripture trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Matt. xxviii. 19, &c.*" Richard Claridge then proceeds to make many Scripture quotations, to show that the Three are one. In a note upon this passage, he gives the following extract from William Penn's Key, page 17, edit. 1693. "They, (the Quakers,) believe in the Holy Trinity of Father, Word, and Spirit, John i. 1. xiv. 9. Rom. ix. 5. 1 John v. 7. And that these Three are truly, and properly One." "They own the Scripture Trinity, or Holy Three, of Father, Word, and Spirit, to be truly and properly One. That Christ is God, and that Christ is man: that

he came in the flesh, died, rose again, ascended and sits on God's right hand, *the only sacrifice and mediator* for man's happiness."—*Ibid.*, pages 33, 34.

We shall now adduce the explanations which William Penn has given, in regard to his belief in the divinity of Christ, and the object of his argument, in the *Sandy Foundation Shaken*. Soon after the publication of this work, he was committed to the Tower; and while a prisoner there, he wrote his essay entitled, "Innocency with her open face, presented by way of Apology for the book entitled the *Sandy Foundation Shaken, &c.*" in which he thus alludes to the cause of his confinement: "That which I am credibly informed to be the greatest reason for my imprisonment, and that noise of blasphemy which hath pierced so many ears of late, is my denying the divinity of Christ, and divesting him of his eternal Godhead; which most busily hath been suggested, as well to those in authority, as maliciously insinuated amongst the people." He then enters into an argument of considerable length, to prove the Godhead of Jesus Christ, which he thus concludes:—"In short, this conclusive argument for the proof of Christ, the Saviour's, being God, should certainly persuade all sober persons of my innocency, and my adversaries malice. He that is the everlasting Wisdom, divine Power, the true Light, the only Saviour, the creating Word of all things, whether visible or invisible, and their upholder, by his own power, is, without contradiction God—but all these qualifications, and divine properties, are by the concurrent testimonies of Scripture, ascribed to the Lord Jesus Christ; therefore, without a scruple, I call and believe him, really to be, the mighty God. And for a more ample satisfaction, let but my reply to J. Clapham be perused, in which Christ's divinity and eternity is very fully asserted."—*Vol. I.* page 268.

Again, in the same treatise, he says, "And, (to shut up my apology for religious matters,) that all may see the simplicity, Scripture doctrine, and phrase of my faith, in the most important matters of eternal life, I shall here subjoin a short confession. 'I sincerely own, and unfeignedly believe, (by virtue of the sound knowledge and experience received from the gift of that holy unction, and divine grace, inspired from on high,) in one, holy, just, merciful, almighty, and eternal God; who is the Father of all things; that appeared to the holy patriarchs and prophets of old, at sundry times and in divers manners; And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the everlasting Wisdom, divine Power, true Light, only Saviour and Preserver of all; the same one, holy, just, merciful, almighty, and eternal God; who in the fulness of time, took, and was manifested in the flesh; at which time he preached, (and his disciples after him,) the everlasting gospel of repentance, and promise of remission of sins, and eternal life, to all that heard and obeyed; who said "*he that is with you* (in the flesh) *shall be in you* (by the Spirit); and though he left them (as to the flesh,) yet not comfortless; for he would come to them again (in the Spirit); for a little while, and they should not see him (as to the flesh); again a little while and they should see him (in the spirit); for the Lord (Jesus Christ) is that Spirit, a *manifestation* whereof is given to every one to profit withal; In which Holy Spirit,

I believe, as the same almighty and eternal God, who as in those times he ended all shadows, and became the infallible guide to them that walked therein; by which they were adopted heirs and co-heirs of glory; so am I a living witness, that the same holy, just, merciful, almighty, and eternal God, is now as then (after this tedious night of idolatry, superstition, and human inventions, that hath overspread the world,) gloriously manifested to discover, and save from all iniquity, and to conduct unto the holy land of pure and endless peace, in a word to tabernacle in men. And I also firmly believe, that without repenting, and forsaking of past sins, and walking in obedience to this heavenly voice, which would guide into all truth, and establish there; *remission* and eternal life can never be obtained; but unto them that fear his name, and keep his commandments, they, and they only, shall have right unto the tree of life; for whose name sake, I have been made willing to relinquish and forsake all the vain fashions, enticing pleasures, alluring honours, and glittering glories of this transitory world, and readily to accept the portion of a fool, from this deriding generation, and become a man of sorrows and a perpetual reproach to my familiars; yea, and with the greatest cheerfulness, can obsignate and confirm (with no less seal than the loss of whatsoever this dotting world accounts dear) this faithful confession; having my eye fixed upon a more enduring substance, and lasting inheritance; and being most infallibly assured, that when time shall be no more, I shall, (if faithful hereunto,) possess the mansions of eternal life, and be received into his everlasting habitation of rest and glory." Pages 269, 270.

William Penn having referred to his reply to Jonathan Clapham, for a more ample declaration of his belief in Christ's eternal divinity, we shall extract the following:—"Thou must not, reader, from my querying thus, conclude we do deny, (as he has falsely charged us.) those glorious Three which bear record in heaven, the Father, Word, and Spirit; neither the infinity, eternity, and divinity of Jesus Christ, for that we know he is the mighty God; *nor what the Father sent his Son to do, on the behalf of lost man; declaring to the whole world we know no other name, by which atonement, salvation, and plentiful redemption comes; but by his name, are, according to our measures, make sensible of its mighty power.*"—*Works, Vol. II. page 14.* Again to Jonathan Clapham's charge, that the Quakers openly deny the doctrine of the Trinity; after declaring this is not a Scripture phrase, but an invented term, Penn proceeds, "Yet if by Trinity, he understands those three Witnesses in heaven, Father, Word, and Spirit; he should have better acquainted himself with what we disown, than ignorantly thus to blaze abroad our open denial of *what we most absolutely credit and believe.*" *Ibid. page 18.*

We apprehend that we have adduced sufficient evidence from William Penn and his cotemporary writers, to show clearly that he was a firm believer in the Holy Scripture Trinity of Three that bear record in heaven; and also in the *manhood* and *Godhead* of Jesus Christ. It now only remains for us to show that in his argument on the doctrine of satisfaction and justification, he not only had no intention to undervalue, or to deny, that holy offering of the body of Christ Jesus for sin, or the imputation of Christ's

righteousness to the saints; but that *these formed no part of the subject under discussion.* We shall again avail ourselves of Richard Claridge's defence of William Penn.

He says, "And as we distinguish between a Scripture Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which *we unfeignedly believe*; and that humanly devised Trinity, of *three distinct and separate persons*, which we receive not, because the Holy Scriptures make no mention of it: so we distinguish between Scripture redemption, and the vulgar doctrine of satisfaction. *The first we receive, the second we reject.* And because Francis Bugg hath dealt unfaithfully with William Penn, in not citing William Penn's account of the vulgar doctrine of satisfaction, *which he only oppugns*; and Francis Bugg could not but be sensible, if cited, would have cleared up the matter to every judicious and impartial reader, I shall therefore transcribe it in William Penn's own words, as followeth:—That man having transgressed the righteous law of God, and so exposed to the penalty of eternal wrath, its altogether impossible for God to remit, or forgive, without a plenary satisfaction; and that there was no other way, by which God could obtain satisfaction, or save men, than by inflicting the penalty of *infinite wrath and vengeance*, on Jesus Christ, the second person of the Trinity; who for sins past, present, and to come, hath wholly borne and paid it, (whether for all or but some,) to the offended infinite justice of his Father."—*Sandy Foundation*, page 16.

"So that by this it appears evidently, that it was not the doctrine of satisfaction, taken simply, and according to the true sense of Scripture, (though the word *satisfaction* is no Scripture word, and were better to be omitted than used,) but the *vulgar doctrine of it*, which hath no foundation in Scripture, and containeth several things in it, that many, both ancient and modern writers, do not allow."—*See Works*, pages 423, 424.

Again, on page 457, Richard Claridge adds, "It was not the doctrine of satisfaction, taken simply, and in the true sense of Scripture, that William Penn opposed, as I said before, page 424, but the vulgar and mistaken doctrine of it, viz. The impossibility of God's forgiving sin upon repentance, without Christ's paying his justice, by suffering *infinite vengeance*, and *eternal death*, for sins past, present, and to come; a *rigid satisfaction*. And therefore says he, [William Penn,] 'I can boldly challenge any person, to give me one Scripture phrase, which does approach the doctrine of satisfaction, (much less the name,) considering to what degree it's stretched: *not that we do deny* [mark that] *but really confess*, that *Jesus Christ in life, doctrine, and death, fulfilled his Father's will*, and offered up *a most satisfactory sacrifice*; but not to pay God, or help him, (as otherwise being unable,) to save men.'

"So that, 'tis as apparent as the sun shining at noon-day, that William Penn neither denies the Scripture Trinity, or holy Three of Father, Word, and Spirit; nor *satisfaction truly stated*, according to the Scripture; but sincerely owns *all* that the *Scriptures do testify* of them; and if any thing besides, or contrary to the Scriptures, be required of us, as an article of faith in common to be believed, as necessary to salvation, we reject it." page 457. He then recites the article of the Church of England respecting the Scripture, &c. and

quotes Bishop Burnet's exposition thereof, after which he thus proceeds: "But notwithstanding all this, Francis Bugg is pleased to say, the Quakers deny the Trinity, and the satisfaction made for the sins of mankind. When *we own the scripture Trinity and satisfaction*; but not our adversaries' unscriptural and imaginary terms and notions, in the stating and explicating of them."

"As to the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction for the sins of mankind, *that we unfeignedly embrace*, according to the scriptures; and therefore Francis Bugg hath done us wrong, in saying the contrary of us. If he had had any regard to truth, and intended to have dealt plainly in the controversy, he should have distinguished between the vulgar doctrine of satisfaction, which, as stated by William Penn, and asserted by some of our adversaries, we *do not receive*; and the doctrine of satisfaction according to the scriptures, which we *do receive*. But instead of this, he conceals the account William Penn gives, of the vulgar doctrine of satisfaction, which carries its confutation with it, and cites only the title of that section, where it is set down and refuted, and then concludes, we deny the satisfaction made for the sins of mankind; whereas, if he had dealt fairly by us, and concluded as he ought to have done, his conclusion should have been, *that we deny the vulgar doctrine, and nothing else*; for the premises *will bear no other conclusion*, according to the true and just rules of reasoning. So that *his conclusion is fallacious, and sophistical*; and proves no more against us than that we deny the vulgar and erroneous doctrine of satisfaction." Page 439.

From the Sandy Foundation itself, it appears that William Penn, so far from denying the scripture doctrine of the propitiation of Jesus Christ, fully believed, and sincerely owned it; since he adduces those very texts of Holy Scripture, which forcibly inculcate this doctrine, to refute the absurd and inconsistent notions which he was combatting. Thus, on pages 10 and 11 of the compilers' pamphlet, William Penn has quoted these striking passages.

"For God so loved the world, that *he gave* his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' John iii. 16. By which it appears that God's love is not the effect of Christ's satisfaction, but Christ is the proper gift, and effect, of God's love."

"To him, give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever *believeth in him*, shall receive *remission of sins*.' Acts x. 43. So that remission came by believing his testimony, and obeying his precepts, and *not by a strict satisfaction*."

"If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not his own son, but *delivered him up* for us all.' Romans viii. 31, 32. Which evidently declares it to be God's act of love; otherwise, if he must be paid, he should be at the charge of his own satisfaction; *for he delivered up the son*."

"And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.' 2 Cor. v. 18, 19. How undeniably apparent is it, that God is so far from standing off, in high

displeasure, and upon his own terms, contracting with his Son for a satisfaction, as *being otherwise incapable to be reconciled*, that he became himself the reconciler *by Christ*, and afterwards by the apostles, his ambassadors; to whom was committed the ministry of reconciliation."

"In whom we have redemption *through his blood*, the *forgiveness of sins*, according to the riches of his grace.' Ephes. i. 7. *Now what relation satisfaction has to forgiveness of sins*; or how any can construe grace, to be strict justice, the meanest understanding may determine."

"But the God of all grace, who hath called us unto his eternal glory *by Christ Jesus*.' 1 Peter, v. 19. He does not say that God's *justice*, in consideration of Christ's satisfaction, acquitted us from sin's past, present, and to come, and therefore hath called us to his eternal glory; *but from his grace*."

"In this was manifest the love of God towards us, because that *God sent his only begotten son into the world*, that we might live through *Him*.' 1 John iv. 9. Which plainly attributes Christ, in his doctrine, life, miracles, *death and sufferings to God*, as the gift and expression of his eternal love for the salvation of men."

We have already quoted sufficient to prove to every unprejudiced mind, that William Penn was perfectly consistent with scripture in believing unfeignedly in the Holy Three, that bear record in heaven, the divinity and propitiatory sacrifice of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; we shall, however, add to our quotations on this subject, some extracts from his letter, dated 11th mo. 22d, 1673, to Dr. John Collenges, who had taken exceptions to the Sandy Foundation Shaken, and charged William Penn with denying these doctrines. It will, we apprehend, do away every shadow of excuse for ranking him among the believers in the notions of Elias Hicks, and rescue his Christian character from the insinuations of the compilers' pamphlet.

"The matter insisted upon, relating chiefly to us, on this occasion, was, *that we, in common with Socinians, do not believe Christ to be the Eternal Son of God*; and I am brought for proof of the charge. To this hath been already answered, that my book, called 'The Sandy Foundation Shaken,' touched not upon this; but Trinity and separate personality, &c. But this will not serve thy turn, thou must both accuse us, and then *wring and rack* our books to maintain it. I have two things to do; first, to show I expressed nothing that divested Christ of his divinity; next, declare my true meaning and faith in the matter. I am to suppose, that when any adversary goes about to prove his charge against me, out of my own book, he takes *that* which is most to his purpose: now, let us see what thou hast taken out of that book, so evidently demonstrating the truth of thy assertion. I find nothing more to thy purpose than this, that I deny a *Trinity of separate persons* in the Godhead. Ergo—what? Ergo—William Penn denies Christ to be the only true God; or that Christ, the Son of God, is from everlasting to everlasting, God. Did ever man yet hear of such argumentation? Doth Dr. Collenges know logic no better; but (which is more condemnable in a minister,) hath

he learned charity so ill? Are not trinity and personality one thing, and Christ's being the *Eternal Son of God* another? Must I, therefore, necessarily deny his divinity, because I justly reject the popish school personality? This savours of such weakness, or disingenuity, as can never stand with the credit of so great a scribe to be guilty of."

William Penn, then instances the cases of Paulus Samosatenus and Sabellius, and proceeds to give the following declaration of his faith. "And now I will tell thee my faith in this matter; I do *heartily believe*, that Jesus Christ is the only true and everlasting God, by whom all things were made, that are made, in the heavens above, or the earth beneath, or the waters under the earth; that he is, as omnipotent, so omniscient, and omnipresent, therefore God. This is confessed by me, in two books, printed a little before the Sandy Foundation Shaken, viz: Guide Mistaken, page 28, and Truth Exalted, pages 14, 15; also at large, in my "Innocency with her Open Face." I think I have dealt very honestly with thee, I am sure to the satisfaction of my own conscience, and it is not my fault, if it be not to the better information of thine. But as thou confessest the scripture hath no word for Trinity, so thou undertakest to prove personality from it, and callest it a foundation. But certainly this retorts with great sharpness upon thee; for first, this being a foundation, as thou sayest, it follows, that there is a necessity of its being known and believed, in order to salvation; but I do aver, first, that there is no scripture for it; next, that ten thousands, yea, millions of people called christians, neither do understand, nor (which is more) can understand any such thing; so mean are their capacities, and so intricate and obscure is the thing itself.

"What dangerous inquiry, and wanton curiosity is that, which cannot set down with this scripture definition, There be Three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit? It is more truly religious, if not to deride, at least to reject, human inventions and pagan philosophy, the chief ingredients that make up the school definitions; and acquiesce in the *naked text of holy writ*, unless the comment were more clear and unquestionable: clear it is not, and for unquestionable, the present protestant nation, call it Popery; as if it were an *infallible mark of sound doctrine, to cry up the fallibility of all doctrine: a piece of new fashioned divinity that is not two removes from ATHEISM.*"

William Penn, then goes to disprove the asserstion of J. Collenges, that "there be Three individual, intelligent, incommunicable, substances" in the Deity, which, not being necessary to insert here, we omit. He then says: "For satisfaction, thou knowest, or oughtest to do, that is a term belonging to the civil law, and was never read in scripture: I have this to say, that the Friend took me right; namely, that I chiefly opposed the impossibility of God's otherwise pardoning, &c., and thou shewest great acquaintance with some late writers, and such, too, as go for no small divines;" [here he inserts their names] and proceeds—"He that would not have me mistaken, on purpose to render his charge against me just, whether it be so or no, may see in my apology for the Sandy Foundation Shaken, that I

otherwise meant, than I am charactered. In short, I say, both as to this, and the other point of justification; that Jesus Christ *was a sacrifice for sin*, that he was set forth *to be a propitiation for the sins of the whole world*; to declare God's righteousness *for the remission of sins that are past*, &c. to all that repented, and had faith in his Son. Therein the love of God appeared, that he declared his good will thereby to be reconciled; *Christ bearing away the sins that are past*, as the scape-goat did of old, not excluding inward work; for, *till that is begun*, none can be benefited, though *it is not the work*, but God's free love that remits and blots out, of which, the death of Christ, and his sacrificing of himself, was a most certain declaration and confirmation. In short, *that declared remission*, to all who believe and obey, for the sins that are past; which is the first part of Christ's work, (as it is a king's to pardon a traitor, before he advanceth him,) and hitherto, the acquittance imputes a righteousness, (inasmuch as men, on *true repentance*, are imputed as clean of guilt as if they had never sinned,) and thus far justified; but the *completing of this*, by the working out of *sin inherent*, must be by the power and spirit of Christ in the heart, destroying the old man and his deeds, and bringing in, the new and everlasting righteousness; so, *that which I writ against*, is such doctrine as extended Christ's death and obedience, *not to the first*, but *this second part of justification*; not the pacifying [of] conscience, as to past sin; but to *complete salvation, without cleansing and purging*, from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, by the internal operation of his holy power and spirit: concerning these points, I refer thee to two books, written not long since by me, called "Quakerism, a New Nickname for Old Christianity," and "Reason against Railing;" in which, these points are fully discussed, as also "The Divinity of Christ," written by George Whitehead.—See Penn's Works, vol. ii. pages 165, 166, 167.

Such is the abundant, and conclusive testimony, to the scriptural soundness of William Penn's belief, in the doctrines of the christian religion. The compilers of the pamphlet, have undoubtedly examined his works, and the very extracts which they have made, prevent them from pleading that they were ignorant of the earnestness with which he defended himself, against the charge of Socinianism. They must have known well, that he had been accused of entertaining the same unscriptural, and antichristian notions, which they are now endeavouring to force upon him, by adducing partial scraps of his writings, as authority for the unbelief of Elias Hicks, and that he had uniformly, and peremptorily denied them. It is therefore disingenuous in them, to print his *Sandy Foundation Shaken*, without the statement of the argument on the Trinity; and also to omit the insertion of those explanatory observations, which he afterwards wrote, to clear himself from these insinuations. By pursuing this course, they have sufficiently evinced, that their object is not so much to inform us what William Penn really believed, as to make it appear that he held those very sentiments which he so repeatedly disavowed, and thus to sustain if possible, the credit of Elias Hicks, by the authority of so great a name as that of Penn.

But happily, this excellent man, has more than once, indignantly repelled the charge of unbelief; and nobly refused to lend his sanction to such unhallowed sentiments. Elias Hicks denies the miraculous conception and the divinity of Jesus Christ; he makes him a mere man, endued with a portion of the spirit of God; and says, that he came only to do *that* which every man is called to do; that his death was no more availing to redemption, than the exit of any one of the martyrs, and that the hope of forgiveness, through his propitiatory sacrifice, is wicked and absurd. That such are not the doctrines of William Penn, we have already proved by our quotations from his works. The Sandy Foundation alone, is, indeed, amply sufficient to show, that William Penn was widely different in his views; and in the course of the following pages, we shall have occasion to adduce other extracts, clearly elucidating the same fact.

SECTION II.

Remarks upon the extracts made by the compilers, from the works of William Penn.

The next extract from the works of William Penn, is to be found on page 25 of the compilers' pamphlet. It is taken from an essay written by William Penn in the year 1698, headed, "A Defence of a paper entitled 'Gospel Truths,' against the Bishop of Cork's exceptions." "Gospel Truths" is a declaration of faith, or a creed, consisting of eleven articles, setting forth the belief of the Society of Friends, in various points of christian doctrine, signed by William Penn, Thomas Story, Anthony Sharp, and George Rook.

The extract made by the compilers, appears to be designed to convey the idea, that William Penn considered the benefits and blessings of the outward manifestation of the Son of God in the flesh, to be wholly confined to the Jews. Presented as it is by them, disconnected from parts which are necessary to explain the author's meaning, it might possibly be *wrested* to bear such a construction. But it was far, very far from the meaning of William Penn; as will be seen when we quote the whole paragraph. He is replying to the eighth exception, which includes the Bishop's objections to the fifth, sixth, and seventh articles of the Gospel Truths, all which treat of the manifestation of Christ Jesus in the soul, by this Holy Spirit, agreeably to the testimony of the apostle John, "That was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world."

William Penn says, "I know some read this text otherwise, as indeed he (the Bi-hop,) did to me in Cork, viz. "That was the true light, that *coming* into the world, lighteth all men;" referring the word *coming*, to Christ, and not to man. But all the versions I ever met with, and I have seen more than twenty, render the verse as it is in our English translations; and all critics and commentators, *except the followers of Socinus*, read and render it as *we* do. And while we have so much company, and so great authority, I think we

need not be solicitous about the success of this point. But besides that the foregoing verse tells us, that the divine life of the Word-God, is the light of men; which shows all mankind have it in them, (for it is the light of their minds, and not of their bodies;) it is impossible that interpretation should be true, in a *strict sense*.* [for the coming of Christ in that blessed manifestation, was to the Jews only: he says it himself, "he was not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel;" Matt. xiii. 24. Again, He came unto his own, and his own received him not; John i. 11.] And *within that narrow compass*, he could not be said to be the light of *all* mankind, that had, did, and should, come into the world; for so both the fourth and ninth verse plainly import, viz. *The light of mankind* without restriction to this or that manifestation of God to men." *Vol. II.* page 897.

Now we would ask, is it consistent with the rules of fair quotation, thus to mutilate the sentences, and change the sense, of an author's essay, in order to make him speak a language which he never intended? The words, "*his appearance in the flesh*," inserted in the quotation in the pamphlet, are *not in the original*, but have been supplied by the compilers.

The sentiment which William Penn expresses, is easily understood. It is a fact, recorded in Scripture, that Jesus Christ, while personally on earth, walked almost exclusively among the Jews, and wrought his miracles principally for their benefit. To this circumstance William Penn alludes, and argues from it, that as regarded that outward body, separate from his Divinity, he could not be the light of the world, since its travels and labours were confined within so narrow a compass. But this is quite another thing from confining the *benefits* which accrued from that outward appearance, to that nation only, which the compilers evidently wish to do; from the unwarrantable liberty they have taken with Thomas Story, in the next following quotation, upon the same subject, (adding a *whole line* to a part of a sentence of his; thereby making him speak a similar sentiment, and directly deny what he has just asserted in the same paragraph.) We are not ignorant, that these mutilations are made to support Elias Hicks in his opinion, that Christ's whole mission was limited to the Jews, and that the advantages of it terminated there; calling him merely, "the Jewish Messiah." But William Penn had a more reverent regard, and just sense, of the unspeakable benefits which resulted to mankind from the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh; as will appear by the following quotation from the paper entitled "Gospel Truths."

1. "It is our belief, That God is; and that he is a rewarder of all them that fear him, with eternal rewards of happiness: and that those that fear him not, shall be turned into hell. Heb. xi. 16. Rev. xxii. 12. Romans ii. 5, 6, 7, 8. Psalm ix. 17.

2. "That there are Three that bear record in heaven, the Father,

* Throughout the following pages, those parts of the quotations which the compilers have extracted, are enclosed in brackets, with an index, or hand, to distinguish them from such as they have omitted to give.

the Word, and the Spirit; and these Three are really One. 1 John v. 7.

3. That the word was made flesh; and dwelt among men; and was, and is, the *Only Begotten* of the Father; full of grace and truth; his beloved Son, in whom he is well pleased, and whom we are to hear in all things; who *tasted death for every man, and died for sin*, that we might die to sin, and by *his power and spirit*, be raised up to newness of life here, and to glory hereafter. John i. 14. Matt. iii. 17. Heb. ii. 9.

4. That as we are *only* justified from the *guilt of sin*, by *Christ, the propitiation, and not by works of righteousness that we have done*; so there is an absolute necessity that we receive and obey, to *unfeigned repentance, and amendment of life*, the holy light and spirit of Jesus Christ, in order to obtain that remission and *justification* from sin: since *no man can be justified by Christ, who walks not after the spirit*, but after the flesh; for whom he sanctifies, them he also justifies; and if we walk in the light, as he is light, his precious blood cleanseth us from all sin; as well from the pollution as guilt of sin. Rom. iii. 22—26. viii. 1—4. 1 John v. 7.—Vol. ii. 885.

The authors then proceed to declare, that *he* is the true light, which lighteth *every man* that cometh into the world, &c. From all which the reader may at once perceive, that William Penn had no intention of limiting the benefits of the blessed manifestation of the Son of God in the flesh to the Jewish nation; in which respect, as well as most others contained in the above extract, the Christian faith of William Penn, and the dogmas of Elias Hicks, are quite at variance.

The compilers have inserted a long extract from “The Christian Quaker,” on their 25, 26, and 27th pages; which we shall next notice. One Thomas Hicks, a bitter opponent of the Quakers, having written a calumnious essay in the form of a fictitious dialogue, between a Christian and a Quaker; one object of which was to prove that the Quakers denied Jesus Christ, and the Holy Scriptures; William Penn, in the year 1674, wrote the first part of that excellent reply to the aspersions of Hicks, entitled “The Christian Quaker and his divine testimony vindicated;” a work which is replete with the most unequivocal and solemn declarations of his full faith, in all the circumstances recorded in Holy Scripture, relative to the life of Jesus Christ; in his divinity, and in his various offices in the accomplishment of man’s salvation; both as relates to that redemption, which he purchased for all mankind, when, through the eternal spirit, he offered up his holy body, an acceptable sacrifice for the sins of the world; and also in the completion of the great work of regeneration in the soul, by the gift of his holy spirit; whereby he is emphatically, that great “Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.”

It is not a little surprising, that a work so truly scriptural in the doctrines which it teaches, and which was written to show that the Society of Friends were really Christians, should now be adduced as proof that the Quakers were *not* Christians. We rejoice, however, in being able to show by William Penn’s own language, that

the tenor of the Christian Quaker is directly the reverse of the system of unbelief which Elias Hicks has revived: and we are persuaded that the only way in which his disciples can obtain the shadow of support from William Penn, is by the misconstruction, or perversion, of the great truths which this treatise contains.

The extract given by the compilers, appears designed to represent William Penn, as believing that mediation, atonement, and redemption by Jesus Christ, are exclusively inward and spiritual, without any reference to what HE did and suffered for us, in his body of flesh. Hence, they have omitted to quote a part of William Penn's chapter, (from which the extract they give is made,) in which he most explicitly declares the extent and benefit of that work which Christ did in the flesh. It would seem that they wish to make it appear, that Christ was no more *our* Saviour, than any other great and good man who lived before, or has lived since, the days when he was personally on earth. Such, however, were not the sentiments of William Penn. The quotation is made from the seventeenth chapter. It is thus headed; "The fourth part of the objection stated and considered—*Christ's death and sufferings confessed to, and respected; they were beneficial to salvation: the light of Christ within, is the efficient cause to salvation, completely taken.*"

From this, it must be evident, that while William Penn justly asserted, that "*salvation completely taken,*" or in its full sense, was attributable to the "light of Christ as the efficient cause;" yet he does, also, fully own and confess the sufferings of the holy manhood to have been "*beneficial to that salvation;*" and as his object in this chapter is to prove the former, so the next, or eighteenth chapter, is appropriated to a most full and reverent confession of his regard and gratitude for *the great benefits* of that *outward sacrifice*.

The seventeenth chapter thus commences: "Having considered the third part of this great objection, I am now come to what chiefly stumbles the people, with respect to the light within; at least, as I apprehend; and that in this fourth and last particular, viz. 'But if the light in every man be Christ, how does it bear our sins, and are our iniquities laid upon it? And how can we be said to be justified, redeemed, or saved by its blood; since all these things are spoken by the holy penmen of the man Christ, or Jesus, born at Bethlehem? Surely you wholly invalidate his life, death, resurrection, ascension, and mediation, by this belief of yours in the light within.'

"This I take to be the very stress of the matter, collected out of the most forcible writings of our adversaries; to which I answer, and let him that reads understand.

"It must be considered, in this last part of the objection, how those questions can be applicable to the light, and yet be reconcileable with those scriptures, that seem to attribute *all* to his bodily sufferings. I hope to make appear, that as we *exalt the first*, so we *dare not, by any means, to slight the last.*"

"The light, or rather HE that is light, in man, for so I have always desired to be understood, (light being a metaphor or a word, taken from the outward day, and chiefly so termed because of man's dark-


ness, which is thereby discovered,) hath been, according to scripture, as a lamb slain since the foundation of the world. That is, the world had not been long created; before man, *being envied by Lucifer, the fallen angel*, was betrayed of his innocency by him; and sin by disobedience, prevailing, the light or principle of life, under whose holy leadings man was placed, became resisted, grieved, and as it were, slain; (which word slain is also metaphorical;) that is to say, the innocent, pure life was, as it were, wounded unto death, through disobedience; and, that lamb-like image, in which Adam was created, by him, through rebellion, lost. Thus, that holy principle, which God placed in the heart of Adam, in which was true light, life, and power, bore the sin, was pressed under it, as a cart under sheaves, grieved exceedingly, and as it were, quenched with iniquity.

“This hath been the condition of that precious and elect Seed, spirit, light, life, truth, or whatever name, equivalent, any may please to give it, ever since that first rebellion, to this very day. And as in wicked men, God’s holy light and spirit, or that principle which is so called, hath been deeply wounded, yea, as one slain, so in good men, that have had a sense of the world’s abomination, hath it also borne many burdens and weights. For the light and life, is one in all, though not treated alike in all. And those who have been reformed by it, and joined to it, have been as one spirit, and have not been without their share of the Lord’s heavy sufferings, from the ungodly world; which was as well a filling up of Christ’s sufferings, that were before his outward coming, as what to this generation, are yet behind to be completed.”—Vol. i. pages 573, 574.

We have here, a very full acknowledgment from William Penn, of the fall of Adam, through the temptations of *the devil*, and a just description of the lost condition of his unregenerate descendants, in whom that measure of the holy spirit, which comes through Jesus Christ, “the glorious luminary of the intellectual world,” is resisted, pressed down, obscured, and quenched. We have also a clear testimony from him, that Jesus Christ has been the Saviour of man, through all ages of the world, one and the same, by his holy spirit, in all, corresponding with his own blessed testimony, “Before Abraham was, I am;” and that those who dwelt with this seed of grace, and suffered with it, were filling up their measure of the sufferings of Christ, for his body’s sake, which is his church.

Immediately following the last quotation, comes the first paragraph which the compilers have inserted in their pamphlet, viz:—

☞ [“And as at any time, disobedient men, have hearkened to the still voice of the Word, that messenger of God in their hearts, to be affected and convinced by it, as it brings reproof for sin, which is but a fatherly chastisement; so upon true brokenness of soul, and contrition of spirit, that very same principle, and Word of life in man, has *mediated* and *atoned*; and God has been propitious, lifting up the light of his countenance, and replenishing such humble penitents, with divine consolations. So that still *the same Christ, Word-God*, who has lighted all men, is by sin grieved and burdened, and bears the iniquities of such as so sin, and reject his benefits. But as any hear his knocks, and let him into their hearts, he first wounds.

and then heals. Afterwards *he atones*, mediates, and reinstates man, in the holy image he is fallen from by sin. Behold, this is the state of restitution! And this, *in some measure*, was witnessed by the holy patriarchs, prophets, and servants of God in old time; to whom *Christ* was substantially the same Saviour, and seed, bruising the serpent's head, that he is now to us, what difference soever there may be in point of manifestation." 

This is, indeed, a beautiful description of "salvation complete," or the work of regeneration, and restitution into that divine image which man lost by the fall; and which was, in some measure, witnessed by the holy patriarchs, and prophets; the same Christ or Word-God, bearing and atoning for the sins of repenting transgressors, in all ages; not a justification or atonement by any works of righteousness they could do, but a real putting on the righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ; yet not to the exclusion of what *he* did for man without them, who has ever been, and continues to be, the Saviour of his people from their sins. For as we believe him, to have been with God from all eternity, and to be that divine and effective Word, by whom all things were made, so also, we believe, that so soon as man had fallen, he became the propitiation, mediator, redeemer, and sanctifier, that thus he might restore man into a state of purity, fitted for the enjoyment of the glory and harmony of Heaven.

Although William Penn wrote the chapter, from which we are quoting, with the express intention of unfolding the sufferings and operations of the light, or seed in man; yet, lest he should be thought thereby to slight or undervalue "Christ's *bodily* sufferings;" he stops in the midst of his discourse, to make the following clear and explicit declaration of his christian belief in their inestimable value and extent.

"But notwithstanding it was the same Light, and Life, with that which afterwards *clothed itself* with that outward body, which did *in measure* inwardly appear for the salvation of the souls of men; yet, *as I have often said*, never did that divine life so eminently show forth itself as in that *sanctified and prepared body*. So that *what he then suffered and did*, in that *transcendent manifestation*, may by way of eminency, have the *credit of the whole work unto itself*, that he ever did before, or might do afterwards for man's salvation. For, doubtless, the very same light, life, and power, which dwelt in that fleshly tabernacle, eminently was the Convincer, Condemner, Saviour, and Redeemer: yet not only as confined to that *blessed body*, but also as revealed in the hearts of men; as he was in Paul, who, not consulting with flesh and blood, against the *Lord of Glory*: did willingly receive him in, to bind the strong man, spoil his goods and cast him out; that he might reign, *whose right it was*. And that the divine life, light, spirit, nature or principle, which resided in that body, was the efficient cause of salvation, *observe the title that is given him*, from the *great work he was to do*, namely, to *save his people from his sins*; there is not one word of wrath, but consequentially. Now, since that sin, is in the heart and conscience of mankind, nothing but a divine light, spirit or power.

can reach and convey purity into those inward parts, and consequently that must be the Redeemer and Saviour from sin. But, indeed, those who have a mind to naturalize that strange figure, into the language of the holy truth; I mean, that to be saved, is only to be saved from wrath and not from sin, whose assured wages is wrath; may have some interest, though no reason, for their implacable enmity against an inherent holiness."

After the quotations made by the compilers, we think the omission of so important a declaration as the foregoing, was not doing justice to William Penn, inasmuch as he appears to have designed it to guard against the supposition that he meant, in any degree, to slight or undervalue the outward manifestation, and propitiatory death, of Jesus Christ in the flesh. To what Christ *then* did and suffered, he attributes the *credit* of the *whole work*, that HE ever did before, or might, afterward, by his spirit do. toward the salvation of men; thus unequivocally acknowledging the transcendency of his sufferings over every thing that the most enlightened and redeemed Christian could ever possibly experience.

The following paragraph is the second quoted by the compilers, and commencing with the words, "But I further confess," would seem to refer to the one which they place immediately preceding; whereas in William Penn's work, they are separated by that which we last quoted, and which they have omitted entirely.

☞☞☞ ["But, I further confess, that his righteous life, with respect to its appearance in that *holy body*, was grieved by sin, and that "the *wright of the iniquity of the whole world*, with the concernment of its eternal well being, *lay hard upon him*, nor was his "manhood insensible of it: under the load of this did he travail; he alone trode the wine-press; that is, *all others* were then *insensible of "that eternal wrath* which would be the *portion of the impenitent "persons*, as well as that it was his great care and deep travail, that "the holy, yet oppressed seed, might arise over the pressures of iniquity in the hearts of men, to bruise the serpent's head in all. And "as outwardly, he *gave his outward life for the world*, so he might "inwardly shed abroad in their souls, the blood of God; that is, the "holy, purifying life, and virtue *which is in him*, as the Word-God, "and as which, he is the Light and Life of the world."] ☞☞☞

*.Note.—We have compared the extracts from the Christian Quaker, as inserted in the compilers' pamphlet, with the first edition of that work, published in 1674, with the Essay as inserted in the folio edition of his works; with the same, in his select works, in folio and octavo, and with a new edition of the Christian Quaker, lately published in Philadelphia, by the friends of Elias Hicks. In collating the other editions, with the Philadelphia, we find that a very unusual and unjustifiable liberty has been taken with the author's work, as it agrees with none of the editions previously published, but is a medley of the whole. Some expressions which are found in the first edition, and which were omitted in the subsequent *corrected* editions, are retained in this, and many others *not in the first edition*, but inserted in the corrected editions, are also found in this.

We have here a striking testimony to that great work which the Son of God came down from heaven to accomplish; to his offering

To make the matter clearer we may state, that in the year 1699, twenty-five years after the first edition was printed, and nineteen years before William Penn's death, a new edition of the first part of the Christian Quaker, written by him, was published: in 1726 the complete edition of his works, in folio, was printed, and in 1771, his select works were published. Now, as these latter editions are alike, and are considerably amended from the first, and as the second edition, in 1699, was published many years before the author's death, there cannot be a doubt but the alterations were made by himself, and therefore it must be considered and received as the *author's second corrected edition*. If the publisher of the new Philadelphia edition designed to print the first edition of 1674, which it would seem he did, by his inserting this date upon the title page, he should strictly have adhered to it. Instead of this, however, there are numerous discrepancies between the two. In the Philadelphia, the first three chapters of the first edition, are condensed into an introduction, commencing the body of the work with what formed the fourth chapter of the original: in this it agrees with no edition extant, that we can find. In the language too, there is much difference; we counted thirty-five discrepancies, more or less important, in the space of two pages; which, however, as they stand in his edition, correspond with the *corrected* editions. But on comparing the Philadelphia edition with the *corrected* ones, we find also numerous variations. The preface is inserted in it, which the others omit, and several expressions contained in the old edition, which were omitted or amended in the subsequent, are again replaced in the new, especially some which might be misconstrued to lessen the value of the propitiation of Christ, &c. Now a printer is certainly at liberty to publish any edition he pleases of an author's work, though courtesy should induce him to use that which the writer had endeavoured to make most perfect; but certainly no one can justify the amalgamation and confounding of two editions of a book, so as to make one *different from all the preceding copies*, and different too, from any one which the author ever wrote. To publish such a book to the world, with the name of William Penn affixed to it, is little less than a forgery, since, as the Philadelphia edition stands printed, it was never written by William Penn.

We think it right to state thus much, for the information of the public, that they may be on their guard, how they receive, as the genuine "writings of primitive Friends," books which have thus been manufactured in their names.

The compilers have used the Philadelphia edition in their extracts, and they have quoted correctly, with some small exceptions. The most material of these is in their third and last paragraph, where the article *the*, is substituted for the definitive adjective *that*, in the sentence where William Penn speaks of Christ's "living that most unblemished life." *The* most unblemished life, may allude to the holiest life that *men* usually live, whereas William Penn confines it to *that* most unblemished life which Christ, and he alone, lived.

up his precious life for the sins of the whole world, when the iniquity of all mankind lay hard upon him, and he alone was sensible of that eternal wrath which would be the portion of impenitent sinners, and under the agonizing weight of suffering, "trode the wine press alone." This is a different kind of belief from that of Elias Hicks; viz. that he did *not* come to offer up his life for sin; that God never sent him into the world for any such purpose; that his death was exactly parallel to that of every other martyr; that his sacrifice was *not* an atonement for any sins, but the legal sins of the Jews, and that it is cruel and unholy to believe that he suffered for the sins of others. For proof that such are the sentiments of Elias Hicks, we refer to our extracts from his letter, &c. inserted in the introduction to this work. How striking is the contrast between the two. William Penn reverently acknowledges all that Christ did for us in the flesh according to the scriptures. Elias Hicks anathematizes this very doctrine which Penn so devoutly believed, and says, "Surely it is possible that any rational being that has any right sense of justice or mercy, that would be willing to accept forgiveness of his sins on such terms! Would he not rather go forward, and offer himself wholly up, to suffer all the penalties due to his crimes, rather than the innocent should suffer!! Nay, was he so hardy as to acknowledge a willingness to be saved, through such a medium, would it not prove that he stood in direct opposition to every principle of justice and honesty, of mercy and love, and show himself a poor, selfish creature, and unworthy of notice." According to these sentiments, William Penn must have been destitute of any right sense of justice and mercy, and a poor, selfish creature, unworthy of notice.

The third and last paragraph quoted by the compilers, appears to be designed by the author, to point out the distinction between the manhood and the Godhead of the Lord Jesus Christ. To the latter he "chiefly appropriates the work of salvation," as to that which fitted the blessed manhood for its glorious mission, by which he wrought his mighty miracles, lived that most spotless life, and patiently endured that most ignominious death on the cross for our sakes, and afterwards raised up his body, as a most irrefragable proof that He was the only begotten of the Father, endued with omnipotent power, and filled with the spirit without measure. Such was William Penn's reverence for that transcendent manifestation in the flesh, that he declares, he "dare not by any means slight it," or rob it of whatever was its due, nor yet attempt to separate what God had joined together. He concludes the seventeenth chapter thus: "To be brief, that I may yet again express our reverent sense of Christ's manifestation, so far as relates to that holy thing that should be born of Mary, take these few particulars in my next chapter."

"CHAPTER XVIII.—*A confession, in particular, to redemption, remission, justification and salvation by Christ.*

"I. Though we believe the Eternal Power, Life and Light which inhabited that holy person, who was born at Bethlehem, and was and is chiefly and eminently the Saviour, "for there is no Saviour besides me," saith God, yet we reverently confess the holy manhood was instrumentally a Saviour, as prepared and chosen for the work that

Christ, the Word-God, had then to do in it, which was actually to the salvation of some, and intentionally of the whole world, then, and in ages to come; suitable to that scripture, "Lo, in the volume of the book it is written, I come to do thy will, (O God,) a body hast thou prepared me," &c. Heb. x. 5. 7.

"II. That as there was a necessity that one should die for the people, so whoever then or since believed in him, had and have a seal, or confirmation of *the remission of their sins in his blood*; and that blood, alluding to the custom of the *Jewish Sacrifices*, shall be an utter *blotting out* of former iniquities, carrying them as into a land of forgetfulness. This great assurance of remission, from the wrath due upon the score of former offences, do all receive in the ratifying blood of Christ, who, repenting of their sins, believe and obey the holy Light with which he hath lighted them. For Paul's being turned from darkness to the light in his heart, was one and the same with his believing in the Son of God revealed in his heart.

"III. This more glorious appearance ended that less glorious service of the Jews; for the figures being completed, the shadows fell. He, in that body, preached and lived beyond those beggarly elements. He drew religion more inward, even into the secret of the heart, and made it to consist in an higher state of righteousness, called evangelical; and at once became both the author of a more heavenly dispensation, and therein an example to all, as well Jews as Gentiles: sealing such a common and general religion to both, with his blood, as would forever end the difference and slay the enmity, that they might be all one in Christ. Thus did he end the Jews' external services, and overturn the Gentiles' idolatries, by his one most pure and spiritual offering and worship.

"IV. It plainly preaches thus much to us, that as he, whose body the Jews outwardly slew, was by wicked works crucified in the streets of Sodom and Egypt spiritually so called, viz: our polluted hearts and consciences; so, unless we come to know the power and benefit of this inward life, answering to and expressed by that outward life he gave for the world, that will avail us little. For so it is, and very marvellous in our eyes, that the life of the crucified can only save those who may well be reputed the crucifiers. Oh mystery! And because those that did not actually slay him outwardly, have slain him inwardly, that is, by their evil spirits resisting and quenching his spiritual appearance to their souls, therefore must such really know that divine life inwardly raised and shed abroad for sanctification and redemption from sin. Oh, how great was his love to man! Truly larger than man's cruelty; who, whilst he died *by* wicked men, *died for them*; and when dead, they could not hinder him from rising to do them good, who had done their worst for his destruction, thereby showing mercy to those who showed they had no mercy for him nor themselves. "O Jerusalem! Jerusalem! how often would I have gathered thee, and thou wouldst not," &c.

"V. That expression of his is greatly worth our notice, "I lay down my life for the world." All he did was for the good of the world, and *particularly* the laying down of his life, that he might both express his love and our duty. Had he not desired man's salvation,

and for that purpose prepared a body in which to visit him, and by his daily labours among men to further their eternal happiness, the Jews had never been able to put him to death. But being come, and when come so hardly used, herein did he recommend his great love to us, that *besides the inward weights of sin he bore* with his deep concernment for man's eternal well-being, he cheerfully *offered up his bodily life*, to recommend and ratify his love for the remission of sin, and gave us an holy example to follow his steps. But these words will bear another sense too, as do those he spoke to the Jews: "Unless ye eat my flesh, and drink my blood, you have no life in you." John vi. 51, 52, 53, 54, 62, 63.—Where we may plainly see, that as the Jews vainly and carnally fancied he meant his outward body only, to which they opposed the impossibility of the thing; so Christ declares their mistake of his meaning, to his disciples, in these few but deep words: "the flesh profiteth nothing; it is the spirit that quickeneth." So that the words are true and weighty in *both* senses.

"VI. And we further acknowledge, that in that holy body the Divine principle of light and life did discover the depths of satan's darkness, encounter hell, death, and the grave, and every temptation it was possible for the serpent, with all his power and subtility, to beset him with, (in which sense he was made like unto us in all things, sin excepted, that he might be sensible of our infirmities,) yea, the Divine life travailed under all, administering strength to, and supporting the outward man, that it might answer the end of its appointment, and in the end utterly defeat and for ever overcome the power of the tempter, bruising the serpent's head *in general*, as prince of darkness, and God of the world, and in a plain combat giving him that foil, which in good measure *shook his foundation*, divided his kingdom, chased away his lying oracles, and proved a very fatal blow to his whole empire. Which holy conquest, obtained by sweat of blood, and deepest agonies, with holy patience, may not unfitly be compared to that of some worldly prince, maintaining a righteous cause against an usurper of his territories, whom he puts to rout in the open field, (by which I understand the general conquest,) yet, many towns, and cities, and citadels, remaining strongly garrisoned, (by which I understand, particular men and women enslaved by sin,) they are not thereby overcome, though the approach be easier to them, and that they are truly more accessible than before.

"The *One Seed*, who is Christ, who is God over all blessed for ever, though he gave this proof of his everlasting arm, that it has brought a *general salvation*, by a plain overthrow of the god of this world, the enemy of his glory, and thereby weakened his power, as in himself, (which is the single battle fought in garments rolled in blood between the two seeds, spirits, natures, and powers, God and mannon, Christ and belial,) yet there are also many towns, cities, and citadels to vanquish, which are strongly garrisoned by this God of the world, to wit, the souls of men and women possessed and enslaved by him. So that though their hearts are more accessible by that general victory over the very spirit of darkness, and that light may be more clear and broken forth, yet unless those par-

ticular places or persons are besieged and taken, their goods spoiled, and houses sacked of all their strange gods, and so come to be redeemed from under the yoke of that Pharaonian task master, reclaimed, renewed, sanctified, and divinely naturalized and brought into an holy subjection to him, who is Lord from Heaven, the right Heir of all things, and receive his mark, and bear his image, those places or persons must needs be under the power of the prince of darkness, the god of this world, who reigns and rules in the hearts of the children of disobedience.

“To conclude, we say, though this general victory was obtained, and holy privileges therewith, and that the holy body was instrumentally a sharer therein, yet both the efficient or chiefest cause was the *divine light or life*, that so clearly discriminated and deeply wounded this mystery of iniquity; and that none can be thereby benefited, but as they come to experience the *Holy Seed of Life*, who is God’s *mighty arm of power*, revealed to effect the same salvation from sin, *in each particular conscience*, and which none can fail of, who first receive it as a *light that manifesteth and reproveth every evil way*, and continue to walk up to it in all its holy manifestations.

“VII. But there is *yet a farther benefit* that accrueeth by the blood of Christ, viz: that *Christ is a propitiation and redemption* to such as have faith *in him*. For though I still place the stress of feeling of a particular benefit, upon the light, life, and spirit revealed and witnessed in every particular person, yet in that general appearance there was a general benefit justly to be attributed *unto the blood of that very body of Christ*, (which he offered up through the eternal Spirit,) to wit, that it *did propitiate*. For, *however it might draw stupendous judgments* upon the heads of those who were authors of that dismal tragedy, and bloody murder of the Son of God, and died impenitent, yet doubtless it thus far turned to very great account, in that it was a *most precious offering* in the sight of the Lord, and drew God’s love the more eminently unto mankind, at least such as should believe in his name, as his solemn prayer to his Father at his leaving the world, given us by his beloved disciple doth plainly witness.

“For how can it otherwise be, but that it should render God most propitious to all such as believe in Christ, the Light of the world, when it was but placing of his only begotten Son’s *sufferings truly on their account*, that should ever believe and obey him. Yea doubtless, greatly did that sacrifice, *influence to some singular tenderness*, and peculiar regard unto all such who should believe in his name, being the last and greatest of all his external acts, viz: the resisting unto blood, for the spiritual good of the world, thereby offering up his life upon the cross, through the power of the eternal spirit, that *remission of sin*, God’s bounty to the world, might be *preached in his name*, and in his *very blood* too, as that which was the *most ratifying of all his bodily sufferings*. And indeed, therefore might it seem meet to the Holy Ghost, that redemption, propitiation, and remission should be declared, and held forth *in the blood of Christ* unto all that have right faith therein, as saith the apostle to the Romans: “whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith

in his blood." Rom. iii. 25. And to the Ephesians: "in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins," &c. Eph. i. 7.—Because it implies a firm belief that *Christ was come in the flesh*, and that none could then have him as their propitiation or redemption, who withstood the acknowledgment of, and belief in his *visible appearance*, which John tells us, some denied. 2. That he came in order to the remission, redemption, and salvation of the world. 3. That his so dying, was both an evident token of his love, and strong argument of confirmation of his message and work. 4. That it might the better end the Jews' shadowy services, by an allusion to the way of their temporary and typical sacrifices, as the whole epistle to the Hebrews sheweth. 5. And that by bringing, through the holy light in every particular, into the acknowledgment of, *and belief in the blood*, which was ratifying of that whole appearance, men might be brought unto the knowing Christ after a more inward and spiritual manner, suitable to Christ's own words: "It is the Spirit that quickens;" and the apostle avers, that "the Lord from heaven is that quickening Spirit;" by which eternal Spirit he offered up himself without spot. Nor can any reasonably suppose, that when Christ so spoke to his disciples, explanatorily of what he had obscurely and in parables said to the Jews, that he meant not something more hidden and divine than what they and the Jews saw; yet that which hindered those Jews from the knowledge or benefit thereof, was their stumbling at him, without a confessing of whom, they could never come into the beholding or experiencing of his Divine life in them.

"To conclude, That body was the Divine Life's: "a body hast thou prepared me," therefore all that was done by that body towards the redemption of mankind, was *eminently* the Divine Life's. Yet because often times actions are denominated from, or appropriated to the instrument, as the next cause, though not the efficient or most eminent cause, therefore the scripture speaks forth, (as indeed is the propriety of both the Hebrew and Greek tongues,) parabolically, hyperbolically, metaphorically, the inward substance and hidden life of things, by things more exterior and obvious to the sense, to the end that such mysteries might be the better accommodated to vulgar capacities. Consider what I say, with this qualification, that ultimately and chiefly, *not wholly and exclusively*, the Divine life in that body was the *Redeemer*. For the *sufferings* of that *holy body* of Jesus had an engaging and *procuring virtue* in them, though the Divine life was that fountain from whence originally it came. And as the Life declared and preached forth itself through that holy body, so who did then come to the benefit procured by the Divine life, could *only* do it through an hearty confession to it *as appearing in that body*, and that from a sense first begotten by a measure of the same in themselves.

"This is the main import of those places: "whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation," and "in whom we have redemption through faith in his blood." Rom. iii. 25.—For who is this *He* whom God hath set forth, and in whom is redemption? Certainly the same *He* that was before Abraham, the Rock of the fathers, that

cried: "Lo, I come to do thy will, (O God,) a body hast thou prepared me," (Heb. x. 5. 7,) which was long before the body was conceived and born. But may some say, how is it then his blood? Why, just as the body is his body.

"Those who had faith in that blood believed his visible appearance, inasmuch as they acknowledged that great seal and ratification of it, to wit, the shedding of the blood of *His* body, who came to save the world, and who *alone* is the propitiation, redemption, and salvation of all who had and have right faith in that appearance and message so confirmed, and therefore so often expressed by it, as including all his whole life and sufferings besides. And this is my reason for it,—that it was impossible for any man in that day, to confess to, and believe in the Divine light and life which appeared in that prepared body, but from the inward discoveries and operations of the Divine light with which Christ, the Word-God, who took flesh, had enlightened him.

"However, though the apostles might then so express themselves, thereby to assert and recommend unto the faith of all, that eminent and blessed manifestation, and the great love of Christ therein, as the visitation of the heavenly life through that prepared body, and the deep sufferings of both for the world, being true and spiritual witnesses thereof; yet it was never intended that any should barely rest there, but press after the knowledge of Christ, by faith in something farther, and beyond that body in which he appeared, not excluding our belief in that too. They who knew Christ after the flesh, were to press after some more spiritual discovery of him; and it was expedient that they who almost doated upon his outward manifestation should be weaned from it, to the end his more interior, and indeed, beneficial revelation of himself, might be witnessed by the soul.

"*Faith in his blood was requisite*, that they might confess him whose body and blood it was, to be the Christ, who is God over all, blessed forever; which was the great question with the Jews, whether God was truly manifested in that body of flesh, which they saw? So that the stress lies in confessing to the Divinity come in the flesh: otherwise they would have rejected not only the most signal suffering of the whole manifestation, but consequently, that itself. To conclude, we confess, *He* who then appeared, *was, and is, the propitiation, &c. and in him* was redemption obtained, by all those who had such true *faith in his blood*. But still it is to be understood, that there must be a witnessing of a measure of the same light, spirit, and power, to appear for redemption of the soul from the pollution of sin, in each particular.

"VIII. That justification came by faith in his blood, is clear in a sense; for "by the law could no flesh be justified." That is, the law being added because of transgression, certainly the transgressor could not be justified, *whilst such*, by that law which condemned him *for being such*. Which puts me upon distinguishing betwixt justification, as it is sometimes taken, viz: for *remission, pardon or forgiveness of sin past upon repentance*, and that justification which implies an *acceptance with, and an access to God as a keeper of the*

law of the spirit of life, which is to be made inherently just, righteous, or holy.

“In the first sense, since all have sinned, no man can be justified by the law he has transgressed. Therefore, that great favour and mercy of remission, pardon, and forgiveness, was only then generally preached in the name of Jesus, which such as believed in his message should obtain. Thus “by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified,” because *all* the righteousness man is capable of, cannot make satisfaction for any unrighteousness he hath committed: since what he daily doth, is but what he daily owes. But still such as keep the law are justified. For that a man should be condemned both for transgressing and keeping the law too, would be very hard. What shall we say then, but that justification in the first sense, since Adam’s day to this, hath been *God’s free love upon repentance*; and above all, that by Christ’s visible appearance and suffering, and in his name, was remission, pardon, or forgiveness preached, or held forth to the whole world, upon their believing therein, more eminently than ever.

“But in the last sense, no man can be justified but as he is *made just*, and is found actually *doing the will of God*. That justifies—that is it which gives acceptance with, and access to God. In this sense it was the apostle said, such as are “the doers of the law shall be justified,” and not from the guilt of what they formerly did against it, by their after keeping it; for that is *the free love of God alone, upon the repentance of the creature*; which hath been in all former ages, but never so eminently held forth to the world, as by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ in the flesh.

“So that thus far we can approach the honester sort of professors of religion, or rather, *we were herein never at a distance from them*, viz: that men may be reconciled, and in a sense *justified, while sin may not be totally destroyed*. That is, God upon their repenting of past sins, though not then clearly purged from the ground of evil, may, and we believe, doth remit, pardon, or forgive former offences, and is thus far reconciled; that is, he ceaseth to be angry, or at a distance from them, as when they went on in a state of disobedience to the light. Yet forever we must affirm, that no man or woman can be made a child of God, but as the new birth, regeneration, and the divine and heavenly image comes to be witnessed through the putting off the old man and his deeds, and being baptized by the Holy Ghost and fire into the one holy body, of which Christ, the immaculate Lamb of God, is Head and Lord. So that all those who apply to themselves, or others, the promises due to this state, unto that before mentioned, heal themselves or others deceitfully; and God will judge for those things. So let all people consider with sobriety and moderation, if the things we assert are not most agreeable to the scripture, and that light of truth which is in their own consciences, unto which we most of all desire to be made manifest.

“IX. Nor is this all the good, the coming and sufferings of that blessed manhood brought unto the world. For, having been enabled so effectually to perform the will of God living, and having so

patiently suffered the will of wicked men, dying, therein *freely offering up his most innocent life for the world*, he certainly obtained exceeding great and precious gifts, which as every man comes to believe in the light wherewith Christ Jesus hath enlightened him, and to be led by it, he shall assuredly feel a particular benefit to himself, accruing from that general one procured by Christ, who so laid down his life for the world.

“In short, as we cannot but acknowledge him a Saviour in *that very manifestation*, or coming in that prepared body, who appeared so extraordinarily to visit the world with his marvellous light and truth, and to turn their minds from error and darkness, and who actually converted and reclaimed many, and endued his followers with his own heavenly light, life, and power, whereby to supply his exterior absence with a most lively, piercing, and effectual ministry, for the completing of the rest, from generation to generation: so must we needs attribute this, chiefly, to the Divine light, life, and power, that through the manhood of both Lord and servants, shined forth and revealed itself to the salvation of the world.

“Nor are we yet, as hath been often hinted, to speak strictly, to ascribe the particular salvation of every man’s soul, to the appearance of that same light in nature, in either Lord or servant, (albeit many were reached into their very hearts and consciences at that time, and great and mighty things were generally procured, and Christ in that manifestation became the *author of salvation* unto many;) but rather, as he is the *light of men individually*, he both then did, and now doth appear in the *hearts and consciences* of men, unto the awakening of them, and turning their minds from the darkness of tradition, formality, and sin, which had and doth overcast and darken the soul, to that blessed light in men, that thereby, (as to *them*,) suffered and doth yet suffer, so great and tedious an eclipse. I say, this is the *efficient* cause of salvation, and all other exterior visitations, ministries of assistance, though from the same light, are in respect of the light in every single man or woman but *instrumental*, and *secondary*.

“In this sense, then, man is only a saviour instrumentally, but Christ, both with reference to his bodily appearance, and in the ministry of his servants, is the *most excellent* means, and the *only efficient cause* of salvation, as revealed and obeyed in the consciences of men. So that the question is not, whether Quakers deny any benefit to redound by Christ’s bodily sufferings? But whether the professors allow and acknowledge the *main* of the work to the *Divine life and light*?

“In short, he was the *general* Saviour in that eminent *appearance at Jerusalem*, in which he did so many great and good things for *mankind*; and is an *effectual* Saviour to every *particular person*, as we find him *in our hearts*, an *holy light*, *showing sin*, *reproving for it*, and *converting from it*, into the holy nature of the light, Christ Jesus to be flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone.

“Thus have I declared, according to my understanding, grounded upon my experience and that illumination God has given me, in love and moderation, the very truth, weight, and tendency of the

outward coming of Christ, and his *deep sufferings by and for the world*. And also the nature of his inward coming into the souls of men to expel the darkness that lodged there, and give unto them the light of life. In *both* which respects, I confess him to be the Saviour of the world in general, and the Saviour of each man in particular. But that the benefit according to men from him, as the general Saviour, is only known and received by such as witness him a particular Saviour; and this I will abide by. For "Christ in man" becometh "the hope of glory," and man's being "changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as *by the Spirit of the Lord*," (2 Cor. iii. 18.) is the salvation and perfection of every true christian."—Vol. i. 575 to 581.

The compilers next introduce to our notice, four paragraphs, marked as quotations from William Penn's works, in these words: "William Penn quotes the following, in defence of his doctrine"—See pamphlet, pages 34, 35, 36. What the doctrine of William Penn is, in support of which he adduces these authorities, we are not informed by the compilers, and as their book professes to be made up of the *writings* of primitive Friends, and these paragraphs are placed at some distance apart, it is calculated to make the impression that these authors, whom William Penn has quoted, were Quakers, which, however, they are not. The first is from *Bishop Jewell's* sermon on John, vi. 1, 2, 3, and is merely a testimony to the truth of the apostle Paul's doctrine, that Christ has been the spiritual bread of his saints in all ages of the world, and that *that* flesh and blood on which his church was to feed, were pre-existent to his outward manifestation in the flesh—a doctrine little coincident with the notion, that he was a mere Israelite, destitute of the holy spirit of grace until after the baptism of John.*

The remaining three, are taken by William Penn, from the works of "some considerable separatists," pointing out the scriptural distinction between the Godhead of Christ, as he was from all eternity Divine; and that holy manhood with which he afterwards clothed himself. The doctrines promulgated by our early Friends, were so new to many of their cotemporaries, and were so bitterly opposed by many high professors of the christian name, that they not unfrequently availed themselves of the coincident testimony of other protestant writers, who had in some degree, owned the same doctrines, though their language and sentiments might not, in all respects, be strictly consonant with what the Quakers approved.

But while the compilers make William Penn accountable for the sentiments in the quotations, justice demanded that they should have given William Penn's account of the doctrine, in support of which he adduced them; especially as it immediately precedes the parts extracted by the compilers; in this solemn confession of faith on behalf of himself and the Quakers, viz :

"I will end my part herein, with our most solemn confession, in the holy fear of God; that we believe in *no other* Lord Jesus Christ,

* See extract from "Wisdom Justified of her children," &c. in our introduction.

than he who appeared to the fathers of old, at sundry times and in divers manners; and in the *fulness of time*, took flesh of the seed of Abraham and stock of David, became Immanuel, God manifest in flesh, through which he conversed in the world, preached *his* everlasting gospel, and by *his divine power*, gathered faithful witnesses; and when his hour was come, was taken of cruel men, his body wickedly slain, *which life he gave*, to proclaim upon faith and repentance, *a general ransom to the world*; the third day he rose again, and afterwards appeared among his disciples, in whose view, he was received up into glory; *but returned again*, fulfilling those scriptures, *HE that is with you, shall be in you*; I will not leave you comfortless, *I will come to you again*, and receive you *unto myself*, John xiv. 3, 17, 18., and that *he did come*, and abide as really in them, and doth now in his children *by measure*, as *without measure* in that body prepared to perform the will of God in; that he is their King, Prophet, and High Priest, and *intercedes*, and *mediates* on their behalf; bringing in everlasting righteousness, peace and assurance for ever, unto all their hearts and consciences, to whom be everlasting honour and dominion. Amen."—Vol. ii. page 420.

We have here another striking proof, of the incongruity of the truly christian doctrines of William Penn and the early Quakers, with the notions of Elias Hicks. *They* believed that the Lord Jesus Christ, the eternal Word, took flesh of the seed of Abraham. Elias Hicks declares this to be impossible. *They* believed Jesus Christ to be the Immanuel. Elias Hicks, that he was the Son of Joseph, and no more than any Israelite—devoid of the effusion of the Holy Ghost, until he was thirty years of age. *They* believed that he preached the everlasting gospel, granted repentance and forgiveness sins. Elias Hicks asserts, that he was a mere *outward Jewish Messiah*; that his work was wholly limited to healing the diseases of the body; and that he had not power to heal the soul. *They* believed that the sacrifice of his bodily life on the cross, was a *general ransom* and *atonement* for the *sins of the whole world*. Elias Hicks asserts, positively and unconditionally that it was *not an atonement for any sins, but the legal sins of the Jews*. *They* believed that He that was with his disciples in the flesh, was the promised Comforter, who came in the spirit. Elias Hicks asserts that it was not the same, but another and a different one. *They* believed that Christ Jesus had the spirit without measure, and is made unto his saints, Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification, and Redemption. Elias Hicks asserts that he had only a portion of the spirit; and that we by obedience *may attain to as great degrees of righteousness as he did*.* Let the unprejudiced and honest reader judge, whether there is any more agreement between Quakerism and the dogmas of Elias Hicks, than there is between light and darkness; and whether the latter are not worse than mere "innovations on the doctrine of primitive Friends."

The next quotation from William Penn, is on pages 37 and 38, of

* See the extracts from his letters and sermons, in the introduction to this work.

the compilers' pamphlet. It is taken from the second part of "A Serious Apology for the principles and practices of the people called Quakers," which was written by William Penn in 1670, while confined in Newgate, for attending a religious meeting. It was designed by the author, as a defence of that people, "against the malicious aspersions, erroneous doctrines, and horrid blasphemies of Thomas Jenner and Timothy Taylor," who had greatly misrepresented their tenets, in a book which they called "Quakerism Anatomised and Confuted." The paragraphs quoted by the compilers are from the fourth chapter, in which William Penn vindicates the Society from Thomas Jenner's accusations of denying Christ, &c. The compilers have here quoted unfairly from William Penn, as will appear by the insertion of the following extract. The parts which they have inserted, are enclosed in brackets marked with a hand.

"First, he [takes up an whole chapter, in his endeavours to prove that we deny the Lord that bought us, though very falsely, and equally unsuccessful.

"Because we deny that person, (the Son of God,) that died at Jerusalem, to be our redeemer."

"Which most horrid imputation has been answered more, (I believe,) than a thousand times, by declaring, that HE that laid down his life, and suffered his body to be crucified by the Jews, without the gates of Jerusalem, is Christ, the Only Son of the most High God: But that the outward person, which suffered, was properly the Son of God, we utterly deny, and it is a perfect contradiction to their own principles; a body thou hast prepared me, said the Son, then the Son was not the body, though the body was the Son's,] this brings him, [Jenner,] more under the charge of making him but a mere man, than us; who acknowledge him to be One with the Father, and of a nature eternal and immortal; for he was glorified with the Father, before the world was."—Vol. ii. page 65.

Here is a very material omission, and it cannot be without design. The compilers stop at a comma, as may be seen by the brackets, carefully omitting the latter and important clause of the sentence, where William Penn repels the charge of making our Saviour a mere man, and adds so sound and Scriptural a confession of his faith in Jesus Christ. Now, as this omission could not have occurred "by accident," we would ask any unprejudiced reader, whether leaving out so necessary a part of William Penn's reply, does not carry irresistible evidence that the *carvers* deny the doctrine which it asserts, and were sensible it was directly contrary to the dogmas of Elias Hicks, and would serve to show the discrepancy, rather than the coincidence, of the doctrines of the Quakers with his notions.

What principally induced the compilers to quote the passage, was, probably, the assertion that the Quakers do not consider the outward person to be, in the highest sense of the term, the Son of God. But if they think to prove thereby that William Penn denied, or undervalued the manhood of Jesus Christ, or to draw therefrom an excuse for lessening our veneration for the outward appearance of Christ in the flesh, William Penn has himself

prevented them, since he denies the same charge alleged by Jenner, calling it a "most horrid blasphemy that had been answered he believed more than a thousand times." Had we been selecting passages to show that Elias Hicks denies peremptorily what William Penn as positively asserts, we should have considered this reply of William Penn to Jenner, well adapted to our purpose, since he fully acknowledges in it the divinity and eternity of our blessed Lord.

The author of the Snake in the Grass, adduces the same passage from the writings of William Penn, and apparently to make the same impression respecting his belief, as the compilers wish to do by the manner in which they have italicised his words. To the charge and insinuation of the author, Joseph Wyeth thus replies: "Against this false and unjust imputation, I shall first give William Penn's words in the page quoted; from whence the impartial reader may be able to take William Penn's meaning from himself, and then observe somewhat upon the Snake's *perversion*." He then inserts Jenner's charge and William Penn's reply, and adds, "Thus William Penn; whose plain meaning is no other than that the outward person, that body which our Lord did take of the Virgin, was not properly the Son of God by ETERNAL GENERATION, and was not glorified with the Father before the world began. He is here distinguishing between the Divinity and Manhood of our Saviour, and that according to Scripture. The Divinity was from everlasting, the Manhood not so; that was taken up in the fulness of time appointed by God, born of Mary, nourished, and 'increased in stature,' strength, &c. according to nature's law and course. This body when Christ laid it down, *for the sins of the world*, he did thereby consecrate for us, a new and living way through the veil, that is to say his flesh, Heb. x. 20, and here the flesh or body of Christ is called a veil; by allusion to the veil mentioned Exodus xxvi. 33, which did divide between the holy place and the *most holy*, and thus the apostle shows Heb. ix. 24; "For Christ is not entered into the holy places, made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." And in this sense, and NO OTHER, *have we ever used* the words veil or garment, in this case, and not as is falsely alleged by the Snake to signify, "a body in which angels appear for a time, and throw them off again."—*Switch*, pages 201, 202.

The next objection of Jenner William Penn thus states: ☞☞☞["Secondly, But he says, that we deny Christ to be a distinct person, therefore we deny the Lord that bought us. In answer to this, I shall make these three offers: First, if he will but bring me one Scripture, (for he calls it his guide and rule,) that has directed him to such a phrase as *distinct person*, or that says, I and my Father are two, instead of I and my Father are one: Secondly, if he will but bring me one piece of antiquity, for the first two hundred years, that used any such expression: Thirdly, and if he can deny that the popish school men, (through the assistance of the Aristotelian or *infidel* philosophy, were not the grandfathers and promoters of such like monstrous terms, and uncouth phrases, I will be contented to take the shame upon me of denying, proper, apt, and significant phrases.] ☞☞☞—*Vol. II.* page 65.

William Penn then enters into an argument to prove that there cannot be distinct personality in the Deity, a doctrine which the Quakers have never professed. The paragraph is thus concluded by William Penn:—"Let Jenner turn to the *fifth chapter of John's first Epistle*, where he may find our faith at large in the point, and if he is not satisfied therewith; his refusal shall set the very letter of the *Scriptures*, (his pretended rule) over his head, that he would suggest *we deny*." This chapter contains the declaration that there are "Three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are One."

The third objection is, "He saith that we own Christ to be but mere man, and that *he had his failings* in the world, therefore we deny him." To which William Penn answers, "Indeed if this were as true, as it is false, his consequence would be just; but methinks he should have better studied his own reputation, than to assert any thing so contradictory to his preceding sense of us. For no farther off than the same page, he affirms we deny that *person to be Christ*, that suffered without the gates of Jerusalem, and now, he charges us with disowning him to be Christ, *on any other account*, than that of mere humanity. So that his charge is briefly this, They own the true Christ not to be a man;—but however they own the true Christ to be only a mere man; and they hold a perfection, and yet say that *Christ had his failings*. Horrid weakness and contradiction."—*Vol. II.* page 66.

We are not surprised that the compilers have passed over this third charge of Jenner's, in silence; for untrue and slanderous as it is, when applied to our early Friends, it comes home very closely to Elias Hicks, as the following expressions of his will fully show.—Speaking of the light, he says, "It all comes from God, and is dispensed to the children of men, and it was to Jesus Christ *likewise as man*; in the *same proportion* as to inscrutable wisdom seemed necessary and consistent, to effect the great design in the creation, and redemption of the children of men.—*Sermons*, page 253. "He was tempted in all points as we are. Now how could he be tempted if he had been fixed in a *state of perfection*, in which he could not turn aside."—*Ibid.* See also pages 258, 259, *Sermons*. Elias Hicks speaking of the temptation of Jesus, on page 253, says, "Perfection is perfection, and cannot be tempted. It is impossible."—Now, as he asserts that Jesus *was tempted*, it follows from his own reasoning on the subject, that Christ was *not perfect*, since "perfection cannot be tempted," else he could not have been tempted; and if he was *not perfect*, he must have had his failings. Thus we see how far Elias Hicks is from coinciding with our ancient Friends in their belief respecting Christ.

The fourth objection of Jenner is, "That we hold, 'All that Christ did in the world, was only as a figure and example; therefore we deny the Lord that bought us.'" To which William Penn replies, "This language he cannot produce in any author, that is an *acknowledged true Quaker*; for we affirm he did many things wherein *he was neither a figure nor example*; though in some sense he may be the former, and in many the latter: For in him we have life, and by

faith, atonement in his blood; yet 'twas the language of the apostle Peter, ' For even hereunto were ye called, *because Christ also suffered for us* : leaving us an example, that we should follow his steps, 1 Pet. ii. 21," page 66. If the compilers of the pamphlet had designed to tell the world what Elias Hicks' belief concerning the outward appearance of Christ was, they should have copied Jenner's charge, to which William Penn is here replying, since there is scarcely any point which Elias Hicks more strenuously inculcates, than that Jesus was only our pattern and example—that he was under the dispensation of types and shadows, and was himself a mere type, a figure. His public discourses are peculiarly marked with this feature. Now, William Penn says, that *such a sentiment* cannot be found upon any acknowledged true Quaker, for they affirm that he did many things in which he was neither figure nor example; and as an instance, adduces his being the atonement for sin, through faith in his blood; and also the divine life of the righteous. This acknowledgment of the atonement of Christ, is another evidence of Elias Hicks' innovation upon the acknowledged doctrines of the Society, since he declares the doctrine to be wicked and absurd.

The compilers have wholly omitted the fourth objection and answer, and give us the fifth and last, viz. 5. ¶ [“That we deny “justification by the righteousness which Christ hath fulfilled in his “own person for us, (wholly without us,) and therefore deny the “Lord that bought us.” William Penn replies, “And indeed this we “deny, and boldly affirm it in the name of the Lord, to be the doctrine of devils, and an arm of the sea of corruption, which does now “deluge the whole world.”] —*Ibid.*, page 66.

The reply of William Penn to this objection, the compilers have completely italicised, by which we are to understand, that they consider it a very apt quotation, and doubtless, with their great teacher, would have it stand as an anathema against all those who believe in the scripture doctrine of the propitiation of Jesus Christ, which Elias Hicks has taught them so stoutly to deny. It is, however, somewhat surprising, that persons who have assumed the task of selecting from the writings of primitive Friends, a creed for the followers of Elias Hicks, should evince so little true discernment of the common signification of terms, or of the notions which they wish to support. The justification of *impure* persons by an imputed righteousness, *wholly without them*, has no more connexion with the doctrine of propitiation by the sacrifice of Christ, than the dogmas of Elias Hicks have to do with genuine Quakerism. The Quakers reverently embrace and own the latter, and ever have done so, but reject the former. Now Elias Hicks entirely rejects both, and denies them in terms of the greatest contempt. William Penn is, therefore, no authority for him; as in this reply to Jenner he alludes *wholly* to that which Friends have always denied, viz. the justification of sinners *in their sins*, and not to the propitiation of our blessed Lord, as we shall now prove.

To what we last quoted, William Penn adds, “I shall not much insist upon this, [Jenner's fifth objection,] as I have not upon the other four particulars, they having been irrefragably considered and

answered, by my friend and partner in this discourse, in his first part of this apology: only this I shall observe and add—First, “no man can be justified without faith, (says Jenner.) No man hath faith without works, (any more than a body can live without a spirit,) says James. Therefore the works of righteousness by *the spirit of Christ Jesus* are necessary to justification. Secondly, if men may be justified *whilst impure*, then God quits the *guilty*, contrary to the scripture; which cannot be. Thirdly, death came by actual sin, not imputative *in his sense*; therefore justification *unto life*, comes by actual righteousness, and not imputative. Fourthly, this speaks peace to the wicked, *whilst wicked*; but there is no peace to the wicked saith my God. Fifthly, men are dead and alive at the same time, by this doctrine; for they may be *dead in sin*, and yet alive in another’s righteousness, not inherent; and consequently men may be damned actually, and saved imputatively. Sixthly, but since men are to reap what they sow, and that every one shall be rewarded, according to his works; and that none are justified but the children of God; and that none are children but who are led by the spirit of God; and that none are so led but those that bring forth fruits thereof, which is holiness; ’tis not the oil in another’s lamp, but in our own only, which will serve our turns; I mean, the rejoicing must be in ourselves, and not in another; *yet to Christ’s holy power ALONE, do we ascribe it, who works all our works in us and for us.*”

This were proof sufficient to show that William Penn was treating upon a doctrine entirely different from that of the propitiation, and one which no society of Christians, that we are acquainted with, now hold. But there is yet further evidence in vindication of William Penn. Thomas Hicks, a bitter opponent of Friends, thinking, as our compilers have since done, that the sentence which they have italicised, was well adapted to this purpose, quotes it, in his dialogue between a Christian and a Quaker, making the latter use it, in reply to the query of the former—to this William Penn, among other observations, rejoins.

“If any living, will produce me but one passage out of scripture, that tells of a justification by such a righteousness, as is *wholly without us*, I shall fall under its authority; but if we *only deny men’s corrupt conceits*, and *sin-pleasing glosses*, and they offer us nothing to our confutation or better information, we shall not think *bare quotations* of our books to be sufficient answers.” In a note at the bottom of the page, William Penn adds,

“If *wholly without us*, then *none of it within us*. It was such a justification, as respected being made just, by the *destruction of sin inherent*, by the spirit and power of Christ Jesus; and *not being accounted just from the guilt, and former sins freely remitted in his blood, as an offering for sin once for all, to every one that truly repents.*”—Works, vol. ii. page 522.

This explanation may serve to show the compilers, how little William Penn is to be relied upon, as an authority for Elias Hicks, opinionous; since he always adheres to sound scripture doctrine, and makes that his test; they could not, however, be ignorant, at the very time they were copying the fifth objection, that William Penn

did not design to deny the atonement of Christ, since the fourth objection and reply, which they have injuriously *suppressed*, fully sets forth his faith in it. At the bottom of the very same page from which their quotations are made, William Penn has subjoined a short but full creed, declaratory of the faith of the Quakers; and if the compilers had honestly intended to give us the "doctrines of primitive Friends," they would better have served the cause of *truth* by making use of it; though we suppose it were sufficient reason with them to reject it; because it so directly impugns the notions of Elias Hicks. It is as follows:

"To conclude this brief account, *I am constrained*, for the sake of the simple hearted, to publish to the world, of our own faith in God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit.

"We do believe, in one, only, holy God Almighty, who is an Eternal Spirit, the Creator of all things.

"And in One Lord Jesus Christ, his only Son, and express image of his substance; who *took upon him* flesh, and was in the world; and in life, doctrine, miracles, *death*, resurrection, ascension and *mediation*, perfectly did, and does continue to do, the will of God; to whose *holy life, power, mediation, and blood*, we *only ascribe* our sanctification, justification, redemption and perfect salvation.

"And we believe, in One Holy Spirit, that proceeds and breathes from the Father and the Son, as the life and virtue of both the Father and the Son; a *measure* of which is given to all to profit with; and he that has one has all, for those Three are One, who is the Alpha and Omega—the first and the last, God over all blessed for ever. Amen."—Pages 66, 67, vol. ii.

We would ask—could Elias Hicks, or any of his *initiated* followers, in truth, subscribe to this christian confession of faith?

On page 46, of the compilers' pamphlet, we have a short extract from Penn's works, taken from the nineteenth chapter of the Christian Quaker, page 213; asserting as the sentiments of William Penn; That [☞] "All imputation of general acts of righteousness, performed by Christ without us, will avail nothing for salvation, in the great and terrible day of God's inquest and judgment, when all shall be judged, not by the deeds any other hath done for them, (wholly without them,) but, according to the deeds done in their own mortal bodies." [☞] On referring to his works, we find that the compilers have shamefully garbled the passage, commencing at a comma, in the middle of a sentence, preceded by the words, "*and without which*;" that connect it with, and refer to *the conditions* upon which we receive the benefits of Christ's sufferings and death, as stated in the part which they have thought proper unjustly to withhold. We shall quote the whole, in order, clearly to place before our readers, the unwarrantable mutilation of the language of Penn. It is as follows, viz:

"We shall conclude, then, that *Christ*, the Word-God, is the light of the world, and that all are enlightened by *Him*, the *Eternal Sun of Righteousness*; therefore the light of men is Christ, (for to Him) *Christ*, or the true light, John testified; who gives wicked men to see their unrighteousness, and who leads good men on in *the*

way of holiness, which persevered in, brings unquestionably, to Eternal happiness, and without which, [all imputation of general acts of righteousness, performed by Christ without us, will avail nothing for salvation, in the great and terrible day of God's inquest and judgment, when all shall be judged, not by the deeds any other hath done for them. (*wholly* without them,) but according to the deeds done in their own mortal bodies."]

By thus dissecting the sentence, the compilers have made it convey the sentiment, that the imputation of Christ's righteousness, will on *no terms* avail any thing for salvation; which is contrary to what Penn held or expresses, and, therefore, a libel upon his christian character; since he has repeatedly declared, in various parts of his works, that we are not justified by *any works of righteousness that we can do*, but that he and all true Quakers, attribute their salvation to the Holy life, spirit, power, mediation and propitiating blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. No farther than the next preceding (eighteenth) chapter, he fully sets forth his belief, that Jesus Christ offered up his bodily life, a sacrifice for the sins of the ungodly; that the blood of Christ shed at Jerusalem, shall be an utter blotting out, of all former iniquities, and that upon unfeigned repentance we are thereby assured of remission from the wrath due to all our past offences.

And, although William Penn places the stress of particular benefit, upon obedience to the Holy Spirit in the heart; yet he also asserts, that there was a general benefit, justly to be attributed, to the blood of that *very body* of Christ, which he offered up through the Eternal Spirit, viz: that *it did propitiate*; greatly, says he, did that sacrifice influence to some *singular tenderness*, unto all such who believed in his name, being the last and *greatest* of his external acts, viz: the resisting *unto blood*, for the *spiritual good of the world*, thereby offering up his life upon the cross, through the eternal spirit; that remission of sins, God's bounty to the world, might be preached in his name, and *in his very blood too*, as that which was the most ratifying of all his bodily sufferings. Such was Penn's belief, as contained in his eighteenth chapter of the Christian Quaker, which we have inserted on our 51—59 pages.

After this full confession to the virtue of the "general acts of righteousness, performed by Christ without us," can any person, however prejudiced, hazard the unfounded assertion, that William Penn believed these will avail nothing to the saint's salvation, in the day of righteous retribution. The compilers could not be ignorant of what William Penn had asserted, respecting the outward offering of Christ, in his eighteenth chapter; for they quote from the seventeenth and nineteenth chapters, immediately preceding and following it. Could a mind, impressed with a conscientious regard for strict justice and undisguised truth, consent thus to pervert the meaning of an author, by mutilating his sentences, and impose upon the world as his sentiments, what he never believed? Certainly not. It is not only far beneath the uprightness and magnanimity of a true christian, but beneath the dignity and honourable feelings of an honest man. If the principles of Elias Hicks and his adherents, sanction the use of such means, to propagate and support them, rut-

ten, indeed, must be their foundation, and certain and ir retrievable their approaching ruin.

The next quotations from the works of William Penn, are upon the subject of the Scriptures, and extracted from his essay entitled "A Discourse of the *General Rule of Faith and Practice*, and Judge of Controversy," written in the year 1673.

In order to form a correct opinion of the object William Penn had in view in this tract, and of the point, to prove which, his whole argument was directed, it is important that we should know what he means by the terms "General Rule," and "Faith;" since upon these two words, the principal stress of his reasoning is founded. He says,

"By general rule, &c. we understand that *constant* measure or standard, by which men, *in all ages*, have been enabled to judge of the truth or error of doctrines, and *the good or evil* of thoughts, words, and actions." "By faith, we understand, an assent of the mind, in such manner, to the discoveries made of God thereto, as to resign up to God, and have dependence upon him, as the great Creator and Saviour of his people; which is inseparable from good works."

However clear it may appear to us, that the Holy Scriptures are not such a rule, of such a faith, as William Penn here describes; and much as we may be surprised that he should have thought it necessary to write a treatise to prove what appears so self-evident; it is nevertheless true, that one great objection which other religious professors made to the principles of the Quakers, was their denying the Scriptures to be this general and primary, and only rule of faith and manners. Impressed with a belief that all immediate revelation ceased when the canon of Scripture was completed, protestants generally held, that the Scriptures were the *only medium* through which the will of God was communicated to mankind, and the only means by which the saving knowledge of God, and of Jesus Christ our Lord, could be obtained. Contrary to this opinion, the Society of Friends believed and taught, that Jesus Christ by his Holy Spirit, enlightens all men; that through this sacred medium a channel of intercourse is opened between the soul and its Maker; whereby the will of God may be savingly and immediately revealed or communicated. That this Spirit not only shows to man his sins, and reprovcs and chastens him therefor, but also secretly unfolds his religious duties, both toward his great Creator and his fellow men. Since then salvation is to be attributed to the saving light and free grace of God; revealed through our Lord Jesus Christ in the soul of man, as the foundation of all true and living faith, the Quakers could not but acknowledge and declare, that this Holy Spirit was the *primary* and *general* rule of faith and manners, and the Scriptures under its guidance, a secondary or written rule.

Deeply impressed, by heartfelt experience, with the great importance of these views, they apprehended that professing christians, by rejecting and denying the sensible influences of the Spirit of Christ, and exalting the Scriptures into its place; were prevented from coming to the knowledge of that complete redemption from sin, and perfect obedience to the will of God, which completes the saints'

sanctification, and which the gospel of Jesus Christ was so eminently calculated to produce. Hence it was, that William Penn and his fellow members, considered it of primary importance, earnestly to call the attention of the people to the manifestation of the Light of Christ in the soul, and to labour to convince them, that an entire dependence for salvation upon the Scriptures as the primary rule of life, would eventually be found to be unavailing. But while they did this, the Quakers evinced by practice as well as precept, that they were far from denying the true value of the Bible, declaring on all occasions, that through the faith which is in Christ Jesus, they were able to make wise unto salvation, being profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for instruction in the work of righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect and thoroughly furnished unto all good works. This they proved from the Bible itself; always referring to it, as the evidence of the soundness of all their doctrines, quoting them more largely, both in writing and preaching, than any other denomination of christians; refusing to admit as an article of faith, any thing not found therein, nor to be proved thereby; and always declaring that they considered all pretensions to the Spirit itself, which were incompatible with the sacred records, to be dangerous delusions and errors.

Such were the views and the objects for which the discourse of William Penn was written; not to undervalue the Scriptures, but to put them in their proper place, viz. subordinate to the Spirit. In controverting the popular opinion, that the Scriptures were the *general and only rule*, he contends that as there was a faith before the Scriptures were written, and that faith must have had a rule, therefore they were not the primary rule, yet admits they are a secondary and declaratory rule to all those who have them. In the same treatise from which the compilers have made their quotations, he says, "*A rule and the rule are two things. By the rule of faith and practice, I understand, the living, spiritual, immediate, omnipresent, discovering, ordering spirit of God; and by a rule, I apprehend some instrument, by and through which, this great and universal rule may convey its directions. Such a subordinate, secondary, and declaratory rule, we never said several parts of Scripture were not; yet we confess, the reason of our obedience, is not merely because they are there written, (for that were legal) but because they are the eternal precepts of the spirit, in men's consciences, there repeated and declared. It is the testimony of the Spirit which is the true rule for believing and understanding of the Scripture; therefore, not the Scripture, but the spirit of truth, must be the rule for our believing and understanding them.*"—Vol. i. page 599.

Now, as William Penn here acknowledges, in the very same treatise from which the compilers have made their extracts, that the Scriptures contain the eternal precepts of the Spirit in men's consciences, it will at once be seen that he fully believed them to be a secondary rule; since if the precepts contained in them are eternal, they *cannot alter nor be done away*; and if they are the *precepts of the Spirit*, the Spirit being unchangeable, cannot contradict itself, nor teach *now*, or at any future time, any precept inconsistent with

what it taught in former ages. Therefore as William Penn here declares, they are a *subordinate, secondary, and declaratory rule*, it is therefore obligatory upon all who are blessed with a knowledge of them, to believe in and conform to them.

With the views which we have here stated, the extracts of the compilers are perfectly reconcileable. They are principally taken from nine reasons which William Penn gives, why the Scriptures cannot be "*the rule*." We must recollect here that they are not reasons why the Scriptures are not to be *esteemed*, believed, read, or obeyed; but why they are not the rule, "a living, spiritual, immediate, omnipresent, discovering, ordering, spirit of God," which he says "the rule" is. We shall take up the extracts in the order in which they stand in his treatise.

On page 49, pamphlet, we have the following quotation from his third reason, viz. [“The scriptures, *however useful to edification and comfort*, seem not in their own nature and frame to have been compiled, and delivered as the *general rule, and entire body of faith*, but rather written upon particular occasions and emergencies. The doctrines are scattered throughout the scriptures, insomuch that those societies who have given forth verbal confessions of their faith, have been necessitated to toss them to and fro, search here and search there; to lay down this or the other principle, and then as like the original text as their apprehensions can render it: whereas, were it as plain and distinct as the nature of a rule requires, they needed only to have given their subscription for a confession. Besides, here they are proper; there metaphorical: in one place literally, in another mystically, to be accepted: most times points are to be proved by comparing and weighing places coherent; where to allude aptly, and not wrong the sense, is difficult, and requires a clear and certain discerning, notwithstanding the clamours upon us about infallibility. Now, from all this, with abundance more, that might be said, plain it is, that the scriptures are not plain, *but to the spiritual man*: thus Peter said of Paul’s writings, that ‘in many things, they were hard to be understood;’ therefore, not *such a rule*, which ought to be plain, proper, and intelligible.”]—Vol. i. 594.

It will be seen from this, that while William Penn asserts they are not the *primary rule*, he acknowledges the scriptures to be useful for edification and comfort; and that a *clear and certain discerning*, and comparing the different parts, give to the spiritual man an understanding of the sound doctrines which they contain. We see nothing, in all that he has said, derogatory to the true value and authority which they justly possess among all sober Christians.

Immediately following the last quotation comes the first paragraph of William Penn’s fourth reason, viz. [“4. Again, the scripture cannot be the rule of faith, because it cannot give faith; for faith is the gift of God, which overcomes the world. Neither of practice, because it cannot distinguish *of itself*, in all cases, what ought to be practised, and what not, since it contains as well what ought not to be practised, as what ought.”]—Vol. i. page 594.

That the Holy Scriptures cannot give faith, is true according to their own testimony; and though, *of themselves*, they cannot distinguish *in all cases*; yet, since William Penn asserts that they contain not only *what ought*, but *what ought not* to be practised, they are certainly a *broad and very comprehensive* rule, which, under the guidance of the spirit must be obligatory upon all true believers.

The next quotation of the compilers comprises the fifth and sixth reasons, viz. [“ 5. These very men that say it is the rule of “faith and life, deviate in their proof from their assertion, for the “scriptures, nowhere say so, of themselves. Here they fly to mean- “ings and interpretations: the question arises, *not about the truth “of the text*, for that is agreed on *all hands*, but the exposition of it : “if then, I yield to that man, do I bow to the letter of the text, or “to *his interpretation*? If the latter, as manifestly I do; is the scrip- “ture, or that man’s sense of it, my rule? Nay, the person so in- “terpreting, makes not the scripture his rule, but his own apprehen- “sion, whatever he may say to gain credit to his conceptions, with “others; then mine it must need be, I consenting thereto.

“ 6. How shall I be assured that these scriptures came from God? “I am bound to try all things: if *all things*, then them amongst the “rest. I would fain know what I must try them with? With the “scriptures? Then the scriptures must be the rule of my examina- “tion and faith concerning themselves, which is improper. If with the “spirit that gave them forth, which searcheth the deep things of God, “(a measure of which is given to me to profit withal,) then is it most “congruous to call the spirit, *by way of excellency*,* and not the “scriptures, *the rule*.”]—Vol. i. 595.

In these paragraphs William Penn enforces the necessity of having the aid and assistance of that spirit which gave the scriptures forth, in order to be enabled rightly to expound the true meaning of them, and hence, by *way of excellency*, he calls that spirit, *the rule*. The question, he says, arises not about the truth of the text, for that is agreed on all hands; and for good reason, since he asserts that the spirit which searcheth the deep things of God, gave them forth; which shows plainly how far he was from lessening the authenticity or divine authority of the sacred volume.

Thomas Hicks, in his abusive pamphlet against Friends, entitled a Dialogue between a Christian and a Quaker, puts the following questions to the latter: “Do you believe the scriptures to be the true sayings of God?” To which he makes the Quaker reply, “Yea, so far as they agree with the light within.” To this unjust insinuation William Penn indignantly exclaims, “An arrant forgery!!!” Again he questions the Quaker—“How shall I know that?” Quaker—I witness it. Must I believe thee upon *thy own words*? Qua-

* The compilers of the pamphlet have taken their quotations from a late edition of the Christian Quaker, and Discourse on the Rule of Faith, &c. printed in Philadelphia. In this edition, the words “*by way of excellency*,” in this last sentence, are omitted. The folio edition of William Penn’s works, published in 1726, being printed from the last and best editions of William Penn’s treatises, as affirmed by the editors of it in their address to the reader, we think it proper to adhere to it, in all our quotations.

ker—I would have thee do so. William Penn adds, “Abominable forgery!”—Vol. ii. 552.

Those in the present day who would have us think that no man is bound to believe the scriptures, unless they are specially revealed to him, may perceive, from hence, with what honest indignation the early Quakers would have rejected such a notion.

The next quotation on pages 50, 51, 52 of the pamphlet, comprises William Penn’s 7th and 8th reasons, why the scriptures are not *the Rule*. The objections which the author urges in these two sections, against the doctrine of the scriptures being the primary and general rule, are such as arise from the possibility of errors having occurred in transcribing and printing, and from the various copies and readings. Although the *compilers* may consider them as conclusive testimony against the divine authority of holy scripture, yet William Penn is far from supporting them in such an opinion. For he does not state them as actually *existing*, but reasons upon the possibility that they might occur, solely to counteract the opinion of those who asserted that “the scriptures are the General Rule, &c., in opposition to the spirit,” and to show the doubts they might be introduced into, “who had gone from that heavenly gift in themselves, by which the Holy Scriptures are truly discerned, relished, and distinguished from the traditions of men.” He expresses, himself, not the slightest doubt of their authenticity or genuineness, nor of the correctness of our present translation, but in the most unequivocal manner asserts that they were given forth by the Holy Spirit of God; and that “the question arises not about the truth of the text, since that is agreed on all hands,” which alone, is positive evidence of his unshaken belief in their authenticity and genuineness. To confirm his assertion, we shall add to it, the following satisfactory testimony, given by one of the most learned biblical critics that the world has ever produced, which will corroborate Penn’s belief that there can be no question about the correctness of the text. We allude to the indefatigable Thomas Hartwell Horne, to whose extensive and profound researches, the christian world is indebted for much valuable information on the subject. In his “Introduction to the Holy Scriptures, &c.” a work which we do earnestly recommend, to the careful perusal of all our readers; he makes these excellent remarks, viz:

“Although the various readings which have been discovered by learned men, who have applied themselves to the collation of every known manuscript of the Hebrew Scriptures, amount to many thousands, yet these differences are of so little real moment, that their laborious collations afford us scarcely any opportunities, of correcting the sacred text in important passages. So far, however, are these extensive and profound researches from being either trivial or nugatory, that we have, in fact, derived from them, the greatest advantage which could have been wished for, by any real friend of revealed religion; namely, the *certain knowledge* of the agreement of the copies of the ancient scriptures, now extant in their original language, with each other, and with our Bibles.”—*Horne’s Introduction*, vol. i. page 114, 4th edit.

Of the New Testament, he says—"The manuscripts of the New Testament, which are extant, are far more numerous, than those of any single classic author whomsoever: upwards of three hundred and fifty were collected by Griesbach, for his celebrated critical edition. These manuscripts, it is true, are not all entire: most of them contain only the Gospels; others, the Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles, and a few contain the Apocalypse or Revelation of John. But they were all written in very different and distant parts of the world; several of them are *upwards of twelve hundred years old*, and give us the books of the New Testament, in all essential points, *perfectly accordant with each other*: as any person may readily ascertain, by examining the critical editions published by Mill, Kuster, Bengel, Wetstein, and Griesbach. The thirty thousand various readings, which are said to be found in the manuscripts, collated by Dr. Mill, and the hundred and fifty thousand which Griesbach's edition is said to contain, in *no degree whatever*, affect the *general credit and integrity of the text*."

"In fact, the more copies are multiplied, and the more numerous the transcripts and translations from the original, the more likely is it, that the genuine text, and the true original reading, will be investigated and ascertained. The most correct and accurate ancient classics, now extant, are those, of which we have the greatest number of manuscripts; and the most depraved, mutilated, and inaccurate editions of the old writers, are those of which we have the fewest manuscripts, and perhaps only a single manuscript, extant. Such are Athenæus, Clemens Romanus, Hesychius, and Photius.

"But of this formidable mass of various readings, which have been collected by the diligence of collators, not one tenth, nay, not one hundredth part, *either makes, or can make, any perceptible, or at least any material alteration in the sense in any modern version*. They consist, almost wholly, of palpable errors in transcription, grammatical and verbal differences, such as the insertion or omission of an article, the substitution of a word for its equivalent, and the transposition of a word or two in a sentence."



"Even the few that do change the sense, affect it only in passages relating to unimportant, historical, and geographical circumstances, or other collateral matters; and the *still smaller number*, that make any alteration in things of consequence, do not on that account, place us in any absolute uncertainty."—page 117, 118.—On the same page,

"*The very worst manuscript extant, would not pervert one article of our faith, or destroy one moral precept. All the omissions of the ancient manuscripts put together, could not countenance the omission of one essential doctrine of the gospel*, relating either to faith, or morals; and all the *additions*, countenanced by the whole mass of manuscripts, already collated, do not introduce a single point essential either to faith or manners, beyond what may be found in the Complutensian or Elzevir editions. And though for the beauty, emphasis, and critical perfection of the *letter* of the New Testament, a new edition formed on Griesbach's plan, is desirable; yet *from such an one, infidelity can expect no help; false doctrine no support*;

and even true religion, no accession to its excellence—as indeed it needs none.

“The *general uniformity*, therefore, of the manuscripts of the New Testament, which are dispersed through all the countries in the known world, and in so great a variety of languages, is *truly astonishing*; and demonstrates both the veneration in which the scriptures, have uniformly been held, and the *singular care* which was taken in transcribing them; and so far are the various readings, contained in these manuscripts, from being hostile to the uncorrupted preservation of the books of the New Testament, (as *some sceptics have boldly affirmed*, and some timid christians have apprehended,) that they afford us, on the contrary, *an additional and most convincing proof*, that *they exist at present, in all essential points, precisely the same as they were, when they left the hands of their authors.*”—pages 118, 119.

We have only to add to this conclusive testimony, our earnest wish that Elias Hicks, and his followers, would take the pains to read the able and interesting works, which have been written in defence of the sacred volume; and to examine for themselves the very great weight of evidence, amounting to *absolute certainty*. that such of the inspired writings, as we have received, are preserved to us, in a state of purity and completeness; which, amidst the revolutions of empires, the fall of governments, and *all the changes* which this transitory world is subject to, can only be attributed to the miraculous interference of that Almighty Providence, at whose hand we have received the blessing; and to whom we shall as certainly have to account for the right use of it. We are fully persuaded that the weak and childish objections, that “they were altered by the Pope,” and “written by nobody knows who”—and such like unfounded cavils, can only proceed from downright ignorance, to which unbelief has added its usual concomitants, presumption and arrogance.

The next extract of the compilers, in the order of William Penn's treatise, is at the bottom of page 48 of the pamphlet, viz:  [“Christ left nothing in writing for the rule of faith and practice, that we hear of; and it is not to be thought, that he was less faithful in his house than Moses; and doubtless, had he intended the rule of his followers to have been a written rule, he would have left it upon record with all punctuality; *this must be believed, and that done, on pain of eternal death.* Nor did his followers write, in the method of a rule, as the law was written, nor did they so call or commend what they writ.”] —Vol. i. 597.

That our blessed Lord left behind him any of his own writings, we have no evidence to prove. This, however, forms no argument against the reverent esteem and proper use of those invaluable books, which he was pleased to influence and inspire the holy men of old to write, for our learning and comfort. We have both his example and precept for the use of them, since he often quoted them, and even condescended to do it in order to convince the unbelieving Jews that he was indeed the Christ. And though he was Lord of all, and had in his hand all power in heaven and earth, though the very object of

his mission was to introduce a higher and more glorious dispensation than that of the law of Moses; yet to give irrefragable proof that the revelations of his holy spirit never could contradict each other; he told the Jews, when delivering his memorable sermon on the Mount, "Think not that I am come to *destroy the law or the prophets*; I am not come to destroy, but to *fulfil*." On another occasion he declared to them, "the scripture cannot be broken"—and again to his disciples, after his resurrection from the dead, "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, *that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms concerning me*. Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures; and said unto them, *thus it is written*, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."—Luke xxiv. 44—47.

What higher sanction could we have for the truth of Holy Scripture, than he has thus been pleased to give us, by his own testimony, and although William Penn's remark, that he left nothing in writing as the rule of faith and practice, may have much weight against the opinion which he was opposing, it is far from proving that William Penn had any design to derogate from the inestimable value of Holy Scripture—he was not contending against the reverent use and esteem of them, but on the other hand, enforces it upon his readers in this very essay.

There cannot be a stronger argument in favour of the divine authority of the Sacred Writings, than the fact that Jesus Christ and his apostles constantly appealed to them, as furnishing decisive proof of the coming of the Messiah, and of all the important particulars relative to his holy life, death, and resurrection; showing, in the most clear and convincing manner, that the prophecies of the prophets had been literally fulfilled in Him, and that the glorious day of Gospel Light, had dawned upon the world, and thus evincing that those prophecies were written under the guidance of the Holy Ghost.

The next, and last extract from this treatise, is inserted on the top of page 49 of the pamphlet. It is taken from the conclusion of a long paragraph, and is similar in its arguments to those we have already noticed. It is a little remarkable how close the compilers have clipped the last sentence, closing at a comma, with &c., doubtless in fear, lest they should quote any thing that would serve to show the incongruence of Elias Hicks' opinions, with the belief of William Penn. The last sentence stands thus in Penn; "Now history, though it inform me of *others'* actions, yet it does not follow that it is the rule of duty to me; since it may relate to actions not imitable, as in the case of Adam and Eve, in several respects, [here the compilers stop with &c. Penn proceeds,] *and Christ's being born of a virgin, dying for the sins of the world, &c.* wherefore this cannot be the rule of duty." This last they omit entirely, and it is not difficult to see why, when we observe that it contains a declaration of belief in the miraculous conception and atonement of our bless-

ed Lord; two points which Elias Hicks notoriously denies. Had the omitted part inculcated *contrary* sentiments, the compilers, doubtless, would have been careful to present it to us, duly italicised.

It would have been more consistent with justice to the Christian character of William Penn, and the early Quakers, had the compilers, while they professed to furnish the faith of the Society, in relation to the Holy Scriptures, resorted to such of their writings as are declaratory of their belief on the subject, disconnected from extraneous argumentation. They certainly have acted unfairly towards William Penn, in not inserting such parts of the present treatise, as defend him from the imputation of doubting the authenticity, or divine authority of the sacred text. Aware of the misconstructions to which controversial essays were liable, where the scope of the argument was directed to expose the errors and inconsistencies of an opponent, rather than simply to declare the writer's views, and to prevent his language from being wrested to prove what he never intended; William Penn states the following objection to his own essay—“But do you not turn the scriptures off for an uncertain and unserviceable writing; and as good as reject and deny them altogether?” To which he replies—

“Some, indeed, to render us odious to all protestants, have said as much, in our names, as the consequence of our principles, but not without great injustice to us. The scriptures are uncertain upon their foundation, but not upon ours. Doth our manifesting their faith concerning the scriptures, to be grounded upon their own imaginations, or human traditions, make void the scriptures, or render them uncertain? By no means, for we would have them received, upon the spirit's testimony and evidence, which gave them forth. And though we cannot allow them to be the rule of faith and life, under the dispensation of the gospel, which is power and life itself; yet are they to be reverently read, believed, and fulfilled under the gospel. For notwithstanding the law written upon stone was not Paul's rule, after the Son of God was revealed in him; yet the Son of God taught Paul to fulfil the righteousness declared by that law. If it be to deny and reject, (as some have enviously said of us,) yea, to vilify the scripture, because we cannot allow it to be the rule, &c. Paul then may be said to deny, reject, and vilify the written law, at what time the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus became his rule.

“There is a great difference between asserting that the spirit is the rule, and casting away and vilifying of scripture. And indeed, it is but an old fetch of the devil's, to pretend honour to the letter, that he might, the more unsuspectedly, oppose the bringing in of the dispensation of the spirit; which the letter itself testifies of and to. They that come to be led of the spirit, arrive at the end for which the scripture was given forth: the apostle John did as good as say the same thing, when he told them to whom he wrote, that the anointing which they had received, and abode in them, would lead them into all truth; and that they needed not that any man should teach them:

“To deny this to have been the saints' teacher, is to deny as plain

a proposition, as is in the whole Scripture: and that one age of christianity should have one rule, and another age another rule, that age the Spirit, and this *but* the letter, is more than any man can prove: yet did John so writing to the believers, *invalidate the Scripture, or vilify his own epistle?* I would think none could talk so idly. How then doth our exalting the light and Spirit of Christ, *which fulfils the Scriptures,* (by bringing such as are led by it, to enjoy the good things therein declared,) *reject and vilify the Scriptures?* Does our living up to them, by an higher rule, *make us deny and reprobate them?* Erasmus and Grotius think them *then to be most valued,* when men are witnesses of *their truth* in themselves; See them on 2 Peter i. 19, 20.

“I do acknowledge, they contain an account of several heavenly prophecies, godly reproofs, instructions, and examples, that *ought to be obeyed and followed.*”—Vol. i. page 599.

In reply to the objection, that his doctrine makes void the protestants’ plea against the Papists, “that the Scriptures are *the rule of faith and practice,*” William Penn says, “Answer, *No such matter:* for the question was not, whether the Spirit of Christ or the Scripture was the rule; but whether the Scripture, which is *God’s tradition,* or popish traditions, were the rule to measure the truth of doctrines and practice by. *We grant that particular scriptures,* rightly understood, *may measure* what is agreeable or disagreeable to them: that is, such doctrines and practices as *are contrary* to that part of scripture, more particularly relating to our days, *are questionable, by the scripture;* especially since all parties pretend, that what they say and do, is according to scripture. Yet this concludes not the scripture to be the general and evangelical rule.”—Page 601.

We have confined *our* quotations to the same treatise, as the compilers have taken *theirs* from, and apprehend we have adduced sufficient proof, that William Penn was far from according with Elias Hicks in his denial of the authenticity, divine authority, and true value of the sacred writings. We shall have occasion to give other extracts from Penn’s Works on the subject, which will fully confirm this fact. The devil must have had ill success, we think, with his “old fetch of pretending honour to the letter,” in order to oppose the Spirit, since he is now practising the more specious and sanctimonious “fetch” of *pretending* great honour to the Spirit, in order that he may more successfully destroy all regard to the Holy Scriptures; and thus, open the way to the greatest libertinism in doctrine and practice.

On page 52 of the compilers’ pamphlet, we have the following sentence quoted from William Penn’s works, as though it were approved and adopted by him, viz.

☞ [“George Whitehead says, ‘That which was spoken from the spirit of truth in any, is of as great authority as the scriptures, or chapters are, and greater, as proceeding immediately from that Spirit, as Christ’s words were of greater authority when he spoke, than the Pharisees reading the letter. William Penn’s Works, Vol. ii. page 674.’”] ☞

The passage is extracted from a tract written by William Penn,

in 1676, called "A brief Answer to a false and foolish libel, called the Quakers' Opinions," the object of which as stated by the author, is to reprove the libeller, and hinder others from being *abused* by him, that the Quakers' innocency may be delivered from the *mistakes of his ignorance* and the *reflections of his malice*.

Among other "*mistakes and reflections*" which William Penn refutes, is the author's alleged doctrine of George Whitehead, viz. "that which is spoken from the spirit of truth in any; is of as great authority as the scriptures, yea, greater;" in proof of which he cites the expression of George Whitehead, as quoted by the compilers.—William Penn repeats the language of George Whitehead, in order to show the libeller's unfair deduction from it, and to vindicate the injured character of his friend, from the base insinuation of his accuser. The compilers have italicised the words "and greater," and omitted the explanation of William Penn, immediately following, whence it is evident they would impress upon the public the same unfair sentiment as the libeller had done, and impose it as being the belief, not only of George Whitehead, but William Penn also. But it will appear from William Penn's defence, that they have greatly wronged both him and his friend. He says:—

"Now I appeal to the just witness of God in every conscience, if this adversary was not *very disingenuous*, to take no notice of this distinction: For in short, two things are in our friend's words; first, that what comes from the *same spirit of truth*, is of the *same authority*; and who denies that? Nobody, that is in his senses. Next, that what is spoken by the immediate motion, life, and power of the Spirit, is of more authority; (that is, *force and efficacy* to move, quicken, enliven, or operate upon the hearers,) than the *bare reading* of a chapter in the scripture, especially *by such as the Pharisees were*; as a letter cannot give that impression, which we may justly suppose, the lively presence, mind, and voice of the person that writ it, might. But the end of our adversary plainly is this, to *make us undervalue the truth of the scripture*, and to *debase the authority of the scripture, with relation to its verity*; as if what was said now, by the spirit of truth, in any godly man, were more true than that which was spoken by the same spirit in former ages, *which is a gross suggestion*. The difference lying in these two things, first, whether Christ's words, spoken by his own mouth, were not of greater force, vigour, and authority, to influence or quicken an auditory, than the same words, written and now read. Secondly, whether the *words of Christ* when spoken by his own mouth, were not of more life and authority, than the scriptures *read by the Pharisees*. The first is true, and much more the last; let this adversary then *be ashamed of his injustice*. Christ said of the words that he spoke, the words that I speak they are spirit and they are life, [Elias Hicks asserts that Christ's words were "all but letter." See Sermons, page 113.] that is as they proceeded from his gracious lips, and as they were uttered from that divine power, glory, and authority, which dwelt in him."—Vol. ii. page 674.

William Penn was the intimate friend and frequent companion of George Whitehead; they were often engaged together both in oral

and written controversies, and he must certainly be a more correct judge of his real meaning and sentiments, than either the libeller or the modern compilers; consequently, this defence must completely vindicate him from the unjust imputation designed by the quotation in the pamphlet.

William Penn wrote several essays in 1692, in defence of the Quakers, against some aspersions contained in a paper called "The Athenian." Speaking of the belief of Friends in the Holy Spirit, and their exalting it as the primary rule of faith and practice, he says: "This is the doctrine that is our crime, our enthusiasm, our error; and we are seducers, deceivers, and what not; for asserting, recommending, and pressing it. But if this be to be vile, we are like to be more vile; for we must bear witness to that which the scripture testifies of, viz. the spirit; and prefer it before the scripture, when the scripture does so of itself. No man's letter is himself, nor so noble as himself. *The scripture, is as the letter or epistle of the HOLY GHOST, to men; but for that reason 'tis not the Holy Ghost, nor to be instead of the Holy Ghost to us; nor to be sure, to be preferred before the Holy Ghost. We bless God for the scriptures; we read them with comfort and advantage; and they are profitable, to the perfecting of the man of God, through the assistance of the spirit: The scriptures declare the things of God; but cannot work them in the man: The spirit only can do that; for which cause we honour, exalt, and prefer the spirit, as that which fulfils the scripture; and invite all to receive it, that it may make people spiritual, for to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Wherefore, as often as any of our expressions, are construed to lessen the Holy Scriptures; we ask it as a piece of justice, from all our readers, to take this caution with them; we speak comparatively, not with our books, or with men, but with Christ, his Light and Spirit, from whence the scriptures came. And in this sense it is, that R. Barclay, and others, on the like occasion, express themselves, when supposed to abate of the common opinion of the scriptures. For as face answers face in a glass, so we say and know, the spirit and scripture answer each other. And, therefore, the comfortable evidence of a christian man, is the testimony of the spirit of God within him and the scriptures of truth without him. Let it not, then, be any more a fault in us to direct people to the spirit of God, by which only they can come to the possession of the good things the scriptures speak of; for though they exhort, rebuke, instruct, &c., yet without that great agent, the spirit, influencing and enabling the creature, he shall never experience the truth of the scriptures, to himself, in the most relative and excellent parts of it.*"—Vol. ii. page 799.

Again, in the same paper, "But for equalling our writings with scripture, we have no such expressions or thoughts; it is a word of your own, and a conceit and inference of our old adversaries. There are degrees, as well as diversity of manifestations and operations, but the same Lord, and the same Spirit: Yet, if it will satisfy you, we have ever preferred the Bible to all books and writings of saints and good men."—Ibid. page 800.

We hope that the readers of the pamphlet, will comply with the

reasonable request of this worthy man, on behalf of the Quakers, and avoid the unfair construction which Penn complains of. It would have been well if the compilers had done them *that justice*, which their "*old adversaries*" seem to have had so little regard for, and from the want of which, so many false "conceits and inferences," were injuriously put upon their words, to make them convey a meaning, which, though contrary to the true intent of the authors, yet served the purpose of those who cared not how erroneous and inconsistent the persecuted Quakers appeared, so that their own evil designs were answered. If such are willing to be satisfied at all, as to the true faith of the Quakers respecting the scriptures, we hope "it will satisfy them to know" what Penn here says of them, a more honourable confession than which, could not be made.

It is a circumstance peculiarly favourable to the cause in which we are engaged, that the enemies of the Society of Friends, for several years after its origin, reiterated against them, the unjust accusation of entertaining those opinions which Elias Hicks now advances—and they adduced as proof of it, several of the same quotations which the compilers of the pamphlet have now selected. The Society could not but view the accusation, as one which essentially affected their christian character, and were, therefore, prompt and decisive in denying and refuting it. Those who will take the pains to peruse their replies to the various libels published against them, will find abundant proof of this fact. The passage quoted by the compilers, from William Penn's work, to show that George Whitehead undervalued the Holy Scriptures, was adduced for the same purpose, by George Keith, and by the author of the Snake in the Grass,—a most scurrilous and invidious publication. This coincidence enables us to give additional testimony to counteract the impression which the compilers would wish to make, as Joseph Wyeth and George Whitehead replied to the accusation, in a work entitled "The Switch for the Snake and a Supplement."

Joseph Wyeth, states the charge of the Snake, viz: that Friends preferred "not only their *own writings*, but extempore preachments," and all that they said, to the holy scriptures, which he declares to be boldly and impudently asserting a notorious lie, and adds—"Reader, I cannot here omit, a serious appeal to thyself, on the *great injustice and falsehood* of this adversary; and if thou art one, who by conversation with us, or our books, hast any knowledge of us, thou dost know the charge of this adversary is false: And I do truly declare that our value and esteem for the books of the Old and New Testament, is much greater than for any other book extant in the world, and this George Whitehead doth freely own, and hath declared as much. So, also, in this particular, I will show his *falsehood and perversion* of George Whitehead's words in the place quoted, which the Snake *has injuriously curtailed*." He then quotes the passage, and thus explains:—"So that according to George Whitehead's words, *that speaking, or reading of the scriptures*, which is denied to be of authority; is, when spoken or read by such, in whom that spirit speaketh not, that gave forth the scriptures; and we have good authority for this, for thus our Saviour, Matt. xxii. 24, denied the Sad-

duces, when they spoke and repeated the law, mentioned, Deut. xxv. 5, and thus he also denied the devil, Matt. iv. 6, when the devil repeated the prophesy of the Psalmist, xci. 11, and thus also he denied the Pharisees, of which are divers instances.”—*Switch*. pages 170, 171.

In the Supplement, George Whitehead thus replies to the same charge, viz.—“This also is notoriously false, both in charge and quotation, as is manifest in my answer, “Antidote, page 43, viz: He [the Snake] very perversely wrongs George Whitehead in all these expressions; for there is not a word of preferring our writings to the Holy Scriptures, much less of all, whatsoever we speak, thereto; but a preferring the Holy Spirit, and its immediate teaching in man, to the letter of the scripture: and preaching in the true sense of the spirit, with divine power and authority, (according as Christ did,) to the bare reading the letter, as the Pharisees did.”—page 510.

Again, on page 493, George Whitehead says—“For my part, as I am not in the least conscious to myself, of the least contempt of Holy Scripture, nor yet of the Bible, for I have always preferred it to all other books extant in the world, and more affected reading therein, than any other book, even from my childhood, and often bless Divine Providence, for preserving to us the scriptures; so I know of NONE among us guilty of contemning them: Neither is what’s said from any contempt of scripture, no more than it is of the earth and the heavens to say, “they shall wax old and perish, but the Word that made them endureth, Psalm, cii. 25, 26. Heb. i. 11, 12. But say what we can in this case, to clear ourselves of any contempt to the Holy Scriptures, this our uncharitable judge and accuser will not believe us: He’s bent to asperse, he has swallowed down so much of the sour leaven of the malice of a few false brethren, persecutors and apostates, from whom he derives much of his authority, and thus scurrilously and most falsely imposes upon me, viz: “And therefore, George, notwithstanding all thy mealy modesty, it is, indeed, George, it is the very doctrine of the scriptures which you blaspheme as dust, and death, and serpents’ meat, on purpose to bring men off from trying your pernicious heresies by those sacred oracles.” “This is a pernicious abuse and calumny against myself and others of us, to outface us against our very sense and consciences: and in good conscience, I testify against it; it never entered into my intention or thoughts, so to blaspheme the doctrine of the scriptures as to term or deem it dust, death, or serpents’ meat: the Lord rebuke this lying envious spirit.

“Neither do I vilify the written doctrine and precepts of God in comparison of our new light, (as he falsely calls it, page 177,) but reverently esteem them.* The man makes no conscience of defaming us. Neither do we quarrel with the law and the testimony; nor yet with writing or scripture, as ’tis in ink and paper, but distinguish

* We request our readers to compare with this confession of George Whitehead’s, the epithets by which Elias Hicks characterises one of the plainest and most sacred doctrines of Holy Scripture, viz: the propitiation of Jesus Christ, in his letter to Dr Nathan Shoemaker, calling it wicked and absurd, &c.

between the writing and the things written, which is no contempt to either. *We are thankful to Divine Providence, for both the scripture or writing, and the Holy doctrine, and divine precepts therein written, for they testify unto Christ our light, and our light to the truth of them.*—pages 493, 494.

We are presented, on pages 58 and 59 of their pamphlet, with an extract on the subject of the scriptures, taken from an essay written by William Penn, styled “The invalidity of John Faldo’s vindication of his book, called ‘Quakerism no Christianity;’” &c. dated 1673. We shall insert the whole paragraph, as the compilers have unfairly omitted a part of it. The part they have quoted is inserted in brackets, &c. It is as follows:

“In short, [the scripture is not the rule, but *declaration of faith and knowledge*: that only must be the rule of faith, which gave and ruled the faith of those that gave forth scripture. And because none can give or work faith now, but what did give and work faith then; ’tis not the scripture, but that which was before the scripture, even the Spirit of Truth, which was the author, rule, and finisher of their faith. And if our faith in this age be the same with the holy men’s of old, that gave forth the scriptures, they are no more our rule now, than they were their’s then, who had a rule and a faith before them. *But as it was a declaration of what they believed, knew, and witnessed; so it is a declaration of what we now believe, and desire to know and witness*: John’s epistle was not writ to be the saints’ rule; [the compilers have made it, John’s epistle was writ by the saints’ rule,] for he directed them to the anointing;] yet their *faith and life*, of which the anointing was the rule, *was according* to John’s epistle. Again, *the declaration*, in time, was after the faith declared of; but where there was faith, there was a rule; consequently, that declaration which was after that faith and rule, was not that rule, so that the most that can be said against us, is this: the scriptures cannot be a declaration of your faith, till you come to such a belief of the truths thereby expressed, as they had who writ them; and a great truth it is. But then, say we, the spirit must work that faith, before the scriptures can be accounted a declaration of our faith; or we interested in them: and because that faith has a rule, so soon as it has a being, it must needs follow, that *the declaration of that faith* cannot be either the author or rule of it. Here lies the mistake of my adversary, and many more; that because what a man does is according or agreeable to a thing, therefore that is the rule of the thing done.”—Vol. ii. page 338.

It is worthy of notice, how carefully the compilers have avoided giving any thing in their extracts which was obviously opposed to the favourite sentiments of Elias Hicks. It is well known that there is scarcely any thing which disturbs him more, than an attempt to try his notions by the test of scripture. It at once refutes him, and therefore his policy is, to inculcate the idea that a man is to run lawless, in doctrine, if he is only confident enough to assert that he is guided by the spirit. To avoid any thing like discredit to this convenient libertinism, the compilers stop their quotation in the middle of a sentence, at a semicolon, when William Penn is declaring, that

although John's epistle was not written to be the saints' rule, since he directed them to the anointing, yet *their faith and life*, of which the anointing *was* the rule, *was according to John's epistle*; which important clause they leave entirely out.

Now, it is most clear, that if *that faith and life*, of which the anointing is the rule, is according to scripture; then that faith or life which is *not according to scripture*, is *not* ruled or produced by the anointing or Holy Spirit; and hence, it is easy to see that as Elias Hicks' doctrines are *contrary to scripture*, and he asserts they are not to be judged by it, therefore they cannot be produced or sanctioned by the Holy Spirit.

They have altered the words of William Penn: he says, "John's epistle was *not* writ to be the saints' rule;" they say, "John's epistle was writ *by* the saints' rule"—and though the difference is not material, yet it serves to show how little confidence is to be placed upon the accuracy or honesty of their quotations.

It is exceedingly to be regretted that their cause is such as to oblige them to resort to so mean a shift, as the omission we have just noticed, in order to make out the *appearance* of support for it. Justice to the character of those exemplary Christians and true "Gospel Ministers," whose writings they *pretend* to quote; and especially a regard for the cause of Christ, and the unwary souls whom they would fain beguile of their Christian faith, induce us to expose the unwarrantable and unjust liberties, which they have taken with "the writings of primitive Friends," that their Christian character may be rescued from aspersion.


The sentiments contained in the whole extract, are very similar to those we have before noticed. William Penn shows that the scriptures are not "the rule," that is, the primary and only rule; but yet he expressly says, they are a declaration of what those holy men believed and knew, who gave them forth, and a declaration too of what *the Quakers believed*, and desired to know and witness. Now as Elias Hicks declares his disbelief of the doctrine of the scriptures in several respects, and is so far from desiring to witness those things which they set forth, that he asserts the scripture doctrine of the atonement to be wicked and absurd; it is as clear as demonstration can make any proposition, that he is not one in faith with the "primitive Friends." As the compilers have introduced this essay of William Penn into notice, we shall make a few short extracts from the third chapter of it, viz.

"I do declare to the whole world, that we believe the scriptures to contain a declaration of the mind and will of God, in and to those ages in which they were written; being given forth by the Holy Ghost, moving in the hearts of holy men of God: that they ought also to be *read, believed, and fulfilled, in our day*; being useful for reproof and instruction, that the man of God may be perfect." Page 324. Again, on page 327, after speaking of the apostacy from the Holy Spirit, under the darkness of which men put the scriptures into the place of the spirit, and canonized and worshipped them; he adds—"They are a declaration and testimony of heavenly things; but not the heavenly things themselves, and as such

we carry an high respect unto them. *We accept them as the words of God himself*: and by the assistance of his spirit, they are read with great instruction and comfort. I esteem them the best of writings, and desire nothing more frequently, than that I may lead the life they exhort to; and whatever slight apprehensions my disingenuous adversary is pleased to have of these kind of acknowledgments, I write the naked truth of my heart, knowing I must give an account to God.”—Page 327.

Again on pages 337 and 338, the very same from which the compilers have quoted, after affirming that the spirit of Christ alone, can unfold the mysteries contained in the Scriptures; he adds, “Wherefore we affirm, that repentance, faith, sanctification, justification, redemption, regeneration, &c are all a mystery, never to be disclosed, but by the revelation and operation of the spirit of God in man; the scripture can only *testify to such things, that they are*; but it is the spirit alone that works them, and illuminates, guides, governs, and rules the soul, in and about such things. *’Tis true, ALL the spirit leads to IS ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES; it overturns them not*; for they declare of most of these operations; yet because *we believe, know and witness them, from the conviction and operation of the spirit, before we can possibly understand them in scripture*; therefore the scripture is *but a declaration*, and not the rule of faith, &c.”

The next quotation from William Penn, is on pages 60 and 61 of the pamphlet, being extracted from the second part of “A Serious Apology for the Principles and Practices of the People called Quakers, against the malicious aspersions, &c. of Thomas Jenner and Timothy Taylor, &c.” William Penn in replying to an answer of his opponents, to a pretended objection of the Quakers, divides it into two parts, the first of which is, “They who formerly spoke by *immediate revelation*, as Moses and the prophets, Christ and the apostles, did confirm what they said by miracles; the consequences are plainly this, that there is a *mediate revelation*.”

“To which I reply, That  [greater impertinency no man can be guilty of, than to affirm or teach that there is a revelation not immediate; it is a direct contradiction in terms, for that which is revealed must be *immediately*, or else it cannot rationally be a revelation, but tradition rather. Nay, the scriptures cannot be properly styled the revelation of the will of God, till they are first opened by Him, who was found worthy to unseal the book, that spirit of truth, that opens and none shuts; and shuts and none opens.

“The scripture give this testimony to what I affirm, That ’tis the inspiration of the Almighty which gives understanding: And none can come to the Father but by me: None knows the Father, but the Son, and he to whom the Son reveals him: None knows the things of God, save the spirit of God: I will be with you to the end: If any be otherwise minded, God will reveal it to him, with many, the like expressions, which afford us thus much, viz. That since no man knows the mind and will of God, neither can rightly discern of spiritual matters, but as they are revealed and manifested by the spirit of God—the very scriptures themselves are not

“ a revelation to him ; but the sense and purpose of them, so immediately revealed by the eternal spirit is the only true revelation. “ and the scriptures but a godly tradition.

“ Moses did not conclude his predecessors ignorant of the will of God, who were without a written law. Nor did Job say that the “ naked books of Moses, were able to give understanding, but the “ inspiration of the Almighty ; neither did Christ bid them read the “ scriptures that the Father might be revealed to them ; nor the “ apostles require the churches to have recourse to their writings, “ (then scattered amongst them) as what would *only* reveal to them “ the mind of God. But as they affirmed and preached the impos- “ sibility of knowing the things of God, any other way, than that of “ revelation from God ; so did they attribute all such science ; not “ to their writings, but to his spirit ; directing all to the grace, “ spirit and anointing, as their *most* infallible teacher.

“ Nay, the Lord in his wisdom, apprehending that the people “ would not believe Moses, unless they had some sensible and con- “ vincing evidence, was therefore pleased to say to Moses, Lo I “ come in a thick cloud, that the people may hear, when I speak “ with thee, and believe thee forever : Exod. xix. 9. This was far “ from God’s speaking, so as that the people should not hear as well “ as Moses, or the prophets.”—Vol. ii. page 37.

The compilers have italicised the words “ godly tradition,” to make them emphatical, doubtless supposing that William Penn by using the term designed to lessen the true value of the Holy Scriptures. But it must be remembered that the word tradition, was not so frightful a term in his days, as the fanaticism of some modern professors has made it—divested of the extraneous ideas which of latter times have been connected with it, the term means no more than something delivered, or handed down from generation to generation. Now a *godly tradition*, or as he calls it in the extract on our 77th page, “ God’s tradition,” and “ the letter or Epistle of the Holy Ghost ;” is no less than something communicated by God *himself* to man, and transmitted from generation to generation, which is indeed giving them, a most exalted, though strictly true character.

John Faldo, an illiberal opponent of our early friends, took occasion to traduce the Society in consequence of William Penn’s use of this very term, and construed it, as the compilers would have us do, into an expression of disrespect towards the sacred volume. William Penn replied to Faldo’s book in 1673, in an essay entitled “ Quakerism a new nick-name for old Christianity, &c. from which we extract the following :—

“ John Faldo, page 86, [says,] Traditions of men, that is, says he the scripture or written word.” William Penn. “ Show us that in any book that is subscribed by an acknowledged Quaker. Tradition is a delivering anything down from one generation to another ; and as such the word is inoffensive : but to say, they are the traditions of men, in the sense Christ reproved the Pharisaical religion, God forbid : I had rather my tongue were cut out of my head. Oh ! base man ! To abuse an innocent people thus grossly. The scripture is a godly tradition, or writing, given forth by inspiration, and pre-

served through generations, which we *read, believe, and desire to fulfil* through the power of God.”—Vol. ii. page 312.

The sentiments which William Penn asserts in the above quotation, are similar to those we have before commented upon. To show that while he urged the propriety of considering the Spirit of Christ, as the primary rule of faith and practice, he was not for rejecting, or lessening our esteem for the scriptures, we shall quote the following, from the same essay, and the very same page on which the compilers’ extracts are found. After asserting that the belief of Friends in the Spirit, did not do away the advantages to be derived from outward teaching, he adds:—

“Nor would we be thought to lessen the virtue, use and reputation of the Holy Scriptures, whilst we endeavour the vindication of the Holy Spirit, in his office of revelation to believers—

“They are useful in *two eminent respects*—

“First—Historically; as giving a true narrative of the transactions of those ages of the world, in reference to the Church, or state of both Jews and Christians, their trials, troubles, temptations, lapses, recoveries, and perfect victories.

“Secondly—Doctrinally; as presenting us with *a true account of the principles and doctrines of the people of God*; their holy faith and patience; I cannot phrase it better than a *DIVINE glass*, in which we see, (I say *WE SEE*, who *first* have that heavenly organ, and eye opened by inspiration and revelation;) the states and condition of the primitive saints, which is matter of unspeakable comfort and confirmation, as well as of good example to us; yet still, the efficient cause of all, is the convincing revelation, and operation of the Eternal Spirit of God; and the Scriptures are only useful, as unfolded by the inspiration of the same”—page 37. Again, in page 42, in reply to Jenner, William Penn says:—

“His other Scriptures are as little to his purpose, viz: “Keep this commandment, until the appearance of our Lord Jesus Christ; the things which thou heardst from me, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others—contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints. Hold the traditions which ye have been taught, that ye may be able by sound doctrine, both to exhort and convince gainsayers.” After expressing that he is weary with wondering at the folly of his opponent, William Penn adds:—

“But I answer, Did ever any Quaker in the world deny the scriptures quoted? Do they not own that the commandments should be kept forever; that Timothy did well to commit the wholesome doctrine, he had heard of Paul, to others; and that the faith should be contended for; and the *Tradition, or those Holy Truths*, declared by the apostle, should abide with them to whom he spoke; AND WITH US TOO, FOR EVERMORE. But what has this to do with the necessity of Revelation? Does not the same apostle expressly say, the Spirit of God only, can give to discern the things of God, and that if any man is otherwise minded, God will reveal it to him”—page 42.

In concluding the chapter, from which we have taken the foregoing quotations, William Penn says:—"We end the chapter with this brief summary of the whole—

"First, That by Revelation, we understand the discovery and illumination of the Light and Spirit of God, relating to those things, that properly and immediately concern the daily information and satisfaction of our souls, in the way of our duty to Him and our neighbour.

"Second, That we renounce all fantastical and whimsical intoxications, or *any pretence to the revelation of new matter in opposition to the ancient gospel, declared by Christ Jesus and his apostles: and therefore not the revelation of new things, but the renewed revelation of the eternal way of truth.*

"Third, That this revelation, is the life, virtue, condition, and very soul of the gospel, and second covenant.

"Fourth, That none oppose this, but such as the God of this world has blinded; and *that* through their ignorance of the spirituality of the evangelical dispensation, are, (whilst they pretend to be under it,) sticklers for a more embodaged state than that of the ancient Jews"—page 48.

From this second article, it is clearly apparent, that all the pretended revelations, further openings, and greater advances, that Elias Hicks and his followers boast of; which go to overturn or contravene the ancient gospel of Jesus Christ and his apostles, as laid down in the holy scriptures, are contrary to the faith of the primitive Quakers; and the foolish notion that he is an hundred years ahead of the ancient or modern friends, can only be correct, when applied to those "*fantastical and whimsical intoxications, and pretences to the revelation of new matter,*" which those pious christians so devoutly renounce. Again, in the same essay, page 62, after giving his reasons why they are not the complete rule, he adds—"But, methinks, this our demonstration, should satisfy all; when neither man nor scriptures are near us, yet there continually attends us, that spirit of truth, that immediately informs us, of our thoughts, words, and deeds, and gives us true directions what to do, and what to leave undone; is not this the rule of life? If ye are led by the spirit of God, then are ye sons of God; let this suffice, to vindicate our sense of a true and unerring rule, which we assert, not in a way of *derogation from these holy writings, which with reverence we read, believe, and desire always to obey, the mind and will of God therein contain'd,* and LET THAT DOCTRINE BE ACCURSED, that would overturn them."

On page 69 of the pamphlet, we are referred to the Christian Quaker, for an extract on the subject of the scriptures, to prove what is very true, that those who made great *pretence* to the scriptures, would not come to Christ, but rejected and crucified him. *Pretenders* to the scriptures, as well as *pretenders against the scriptures* have always rejected Christ; while those who have had a sincere and humble belief and godly esteem of those invaluable writings, and have waited to know them fulfilled by the holy Spirit

of Christ, have *ever* found their faith in them, strengthened and owned by God himself. The quotation is as follows—

☞[“They were the great pretenders to scriptures, that would not come to Christ: the traditional, literal, and ordinance men, who also rejected and crucified him. On the other hand, had not Cornelius, and the centurion, with many others, been upright livers to the light within; neither had Peter been so received by the one, nor Christ so followed by the other. But that measure of the divine light, which they had hitherto obeyed, as ‘the more sure word of prophecy,’ led them naturally unto the rising of the ‘day star:’ which, though a more glorious manifestation, yet not of another light, life or spirit; for there are not two lights, lives, natures, or spirits, in God. He is one forever in himself; and his light is one in kind, however variously he may have declared himself; or manifested it at sundry times of the world.”]—☞

It is quite as easy to be pretenders to the spirit, as to the Scriptures, and the state of such is the more dangerous, because the deception is the more complete, and the hypocrisy and security more fatal. Had the temptation for the enemies of Christianity to cloak themselves under false pretences to the *spirit*, been as specious and as powerful then as it is now, doubtless, they who crucified Christ, would have availed themselves of it; and yet if they had, it would form no argument against the certainty or absolute necessity of immediate Divine revelation, since the *abuse* of a blessing is no valid objection against the proper and grateful use of it.

The object of William Penn in the paragraph quoted, is evidently from the context, to show that a manifestation of the Holy Spirit was the guide to all those who lived upright and godly lives, both Jews and Gentiles, and that they were led by it, more readily “to acknowledge that glorious appearance of Light when in the flesh;” to wit, the outward coming of Jesus Christ, than did the Pharisees and elders of Israel, who were great pretenders to the letter. As evidences of the truth of this fact, he adduces the cases of the Centurion and Cornelius, and argues that had not they been obedient to the light within, Christ would not have been so followed by the one, nor Peter so received by the other.

The case of Cornelius is beautifully illustrative of the great duty of making diligent use of the Holy Scriptures. As certainly as he would have missed of the blessings which he obtained by obedience to the Light, in making use of those external means, which it pleased the Lord to ordain for his instruction, and would have sinned against the Holy Spirit; so certain it is, that if we refuse and reject the instruction and benefit which the Lord has designed for us, by a proper esteem and use of the Holy Scriptures; we shall not only lose the enjoyment of the blessing, but also rebel against the Light. It is a truth, that *all those*, who are “upright livers to the light within,” cannot, nay, dare not, slight or neglect any of those gifts, which HE, from whom the Light comes, has been pleased to bestow—and of these gifts, the Holy Scriptures are among the most invaluable.

The Light of Christ was as all-sufficient for salvation in the days of Cornelius as it is now; It could as easily have unfolded to him, the counsel of God, as to bid him send for Peter to tell him what he ought to do. But because the Lord ordained the use of instrumental means, was it any reason, why Cornelius should reject the teaching of Peter, as being subordinate to the Spirit? If when Peter came, Cornelius had said to him, I have the Light in myself—this is all-sufficient for my direction and government; I “have no need to go to books or men;” thou may go thy way, I have no need of any human teaching; would this have been honouring and reverencing the Light, or is it probable that Cornelius would have been favoured with its further illuminations? Certainly not—it would have been *pretending* honour to the Spirit, while at the same time, he was despising those very means which the Spirit of Christ had sanctified for his use.

Let those in the present day, who are making use of this specious but dangerous and delusive reasoning, against the use of the Sacred Volume, remember, that in all ages and dispensations of the world, it has pleased Almighty God to teach his people not only immediately but instrumentally—immediately by his grace and good spirit, and instrumentally by the Holy Scriptures and his faithful servants. Both of these are blessings, sanctified and given for our use; and although the revelations of the Holy Spirit are above all other teachings, yet they are not at our command; and if we slight and reject the secondary means, which are given forth by the same spirit for our instruction in righteousness, we do as certainly rebel against, and deny the Holy Spirit, and whatever pretences we may make to the contrary, set up in its stead, our own self-confident spirit as judge in the case.

The next quotation, on page 72 of the pamphlet, is taken from William Penn’s “Guide Mistaken, and Temporizing Rebuked, or a brief reply to Jonathan Clapham’s book, entitled, A Guide to the True Religion.” It is contained in his 12th section or paragraph, in which he discusses the Guide’s first article of true religion; viz. that there is one God, of an infinite, perfect, and spiritual nature, subsisting in *three glorious persons*. To which distinction of *persons* William Penn replies—

“As for his strange distinction of the Deity, which he enforces on the faith of all that value their eternal welfare, I cannot find one Scripture that will bear him out; and if they had been of so much credit with this Guide, as to have been by them led into their undeniable form of sound words, he would not have intruded tradition for Scripture, to the creed of any, but rather have inserted the text or phrase itself, whose authority might have commanded an assent: and it had become him to give the world a reason for his requiring a submission to, and credence of his doctrine, rather than barely to draw up so many articles, and thus imperiously to call on all for a subscription, as they would be saved; especially since he cannot but know how strongly these very points have been debated in ancient councils, and not less controverted by modern persons of reputation and learning.” [Here William Penn introduces

the different opinions of Arius, Crellius and others, then proceeds.] “But because the Scriptures do not warrant that division into, and appellation of, Three persons; and that he slightly passes over this weighty matter, recommending it for an article of faith, but never arming *him* with reasons, that receives it, for his defence against the strength and great subtilty of his adversaries. I here shall offer him by way of query, what every sober person would desire satisfaction in, before he eternains his principle.”—Vol. ii. p. 11.

It must be manifest to every discerning reader, that William Penn does not mean in this paragraph, to call for reasons, why Christians should adopt, as the expression of their faith, “the undeniable form of sound words,” contained in Scripture; but as the Guide had “intruded *tradition* for *Scripture*,” and chosen to designate the dread Majesty of heaven, by terms not applied to Him in the Sacred volume, William Penn very justly calls upon him to give a reason, why Protestants should copy after him, in his deviation from the text or phrase itself, which might have commanded an assent from all.

Since the Guide had departed from the Scriptural form of sound words, William Penn proposes to him six queries, for his consideration and reply, predicated upon his notion of Three distinct persons, and calculated to show its absurdity. They relate to the Unity, Infinity, Eternity, &c. of the Supreme Being; and, having propounded them, he proceeds to consider an objection which the Guide may make to answering; as quoted by the compilers, viz:

☞ [“If he will tell me, it is a mysterious point, and therefore “he did forbear a farther description of it: I answer, it did the “more require his explanation; for that I conceive a religion “or hope will do a man but little good, for which he has not a reason in himself; and to believe things by rote, is quite as ineffectual as not to believe at all. If he shall say that reason is not to “be consulted or rendered in this case, I answer, that either it is “what deserves silence, and so condemns himself amongst those “fools that will be meddling; or if it is to be *pried* into, *then* to be “understood before believed; or else his three philosophical acts “of election are defeated.”]—Vol. ii. p. 12.

We are well aware that the compilers have made this extract, with the vain expectation, that it would corroborate that fundamental axiom of unbelief, so strenuously enforced by Elias Hicks and his disciples, that we are not to believe what we cannot comprehend. To facilitate such an interpretation of William Penn’s words, they italicise some of them, suppress all allusion to the subject under discussion, and leave us to guess what the “*mysterious point*” was, of which the author was speaking. This was certainly very unfair towards William Penn, and shows clearly, that they *wished* to present him to the world, as asserting that there are no mysteries in religion, and that human reason is to be the criterion of our articles of faith. This, however, was far from William Penn’s sentiment, as is apparent from a fair exposition of the extract made by the compilers, as well as the quotation which we shall insert hereafter.

William Penn does not call for reasons why we should believe in the doctrine of the scriptures, or for the Guide's explanation of the solemn truths revealed there, for he has already granted, that the authority of scripture commands assent. But he demands a reason why protestants should *differ* from the scripture; and an *explanation of that point* wherein they are to differ. And where he says, "that religion or hope will do a man but little good, for which he has not a reason in himself;" he is evidently alluding to the expressions of the Apostle Peter; who exhorted the believers; "sanctify the Lord God in your hearts, and be always ready to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear." This is quite another thing from comprehending the mysteries of God's kingdom by human reason, and William Penn, no more than the Apostle Peter, intended to inculcate so absurd and dangerous an opinion.

When the Apostles were questioned respecting their hope in the Gospel of Jesus Christ our Lord, it was a sufficient reason for them, that all the law and the prophets testified of Christ, and that they had the evidence of His spirit, bearing witness with their spirits, to those sublime truths which they so reverently and joyfully embraced. They professed not to comprehend them by their own powers; but on the contrary declared, that the world, *by wisdom*, knew not God; that the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ, *was foolishness to human wisdom*; and that the *natural man* could not comprehend those glorious truths, which were revealed to the believing disciples of the Lamb of God; and hence the Apostle Paul exhorted them that their faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God. And to this day it remains to be sufficient authority for every humble Christian to believe in the truths recorded in the bible, to know that God has revealed them there, and he cannot give a better or a higher reason for the faith and hope that is in him, than to say, God hath been pleased to reveal it, *therefore I believe*; though at the very same time, not only the thing revealed, but also the very act of revelation itself, may be utterly incomprehensible to his own reason.

Every proposition which is offered for belief, must be couched in such terms, that we may ascertain what the truth is, which we are to believe; but this is very different from *comprehending* that truth. Did we fully comprehend all that we believe, there could be no exercise of *faith*, since faith is the assent of the mind to those truths which cannot be made out, or proved by the deductions of reason, but which are received upon the credit of him who communicates them. If there are no mysteries in the religion of Jesus Christ, why did he thank the Father, that he had *hid* them from the *wise and prudent* of this world; and if they are only *revealed to babes*, it is most clear, that reason is not the key which opens them, else there would be no need of a revelation to unfold them. William Penn does not say in the compilers' extract, that every thing is to be understood, before believed; and though the compilers have italicised the words, yet when fairly considered, they make nothing for them. Speaking of the Guide's "mysterious point," which is no other

than the notion of one Deity, existing in *three glorious persons*; William Penn says, "if he shall say, reason is not to be consulted, or rendered in this case, I answer, that either it's what deserves silence," "or if it's to be *pried into*, then to be understood before believed." William Penn would silently and reverently have accorded with the Guide's exposition of the mysterious point, had he kept to the "undeniable form of sound words:" he would not have asked to have any other reason rendered for the doctrine, than that it was revealed in the bible; but the Guide being disposed to pry into the mystery, further than the Holy Ghost had revealed it in the scriptures of truth, W. Penn very properly says; "if *it's to be pried into*;" if we are to leave God's revelation, and follow human exposition; "then to be understood before believed:" that is, though we are willing humbly to follow the revealed will of God, without consulting flesh and blood; yet, if we are called upon to believe mere human assertions, we demand an understanding of the matter before we assent.

W. Penn is very clear on the subject of mysteries. In the same essay, he says, "Since Paul, who very well knew the mind of God, has left it as the spirit's record in the scriptures, that the deep things of God *knoweth no man*, but the spirit of God, and looking on the true religion to be what he intends by these following expressions; the *mysteries* of God's kingdom, heavenly things, *hidden wisdom*, redemption from all iniquity, all things to become new, to be dead with Christ to the world, and risen with him, to seek the things that are above; in short, *by the revelation* of the Eternal Spirit, to *fathom the deep* and *behold the mysterious* things of God, so as thereby to be translated from darkness into his most glorious kingdom, of righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit; I can by no means subscribe my assent to this Guide's proposition, that man, with his *tallest wisdom*, distinct from that light, or pure capacity, [which] the Quakers affirm God has enlightened and invested all men with, is able to wade securely into the depths of divine *mysteries*, nor allow him that *arbitrium* of working out in his *own strength*, time, and *mediums*, the *knowledge* of true religion; *much less* can I concur with his esteeming any wise, in rightly choosing what religion they would embrace, since it doth not limit him to what is true, in which the choice can only be called right: but rather seems to give him the liberty of *choosing where he will*, in which no election ought to be judged true or wise."—Vol. ii. page 5.

At the bottom of page 73, of the pamphlet, we have an extract from the 6th section of the second part of William Penn's address to Protestants, which, as is usual with the compilers, is presented with great unfairness. The section from which it is taken, is a treatise on "The propagation of faith *by force*;" or the interference of the civil power to coerce people into an assent to peculiar tenets, or the observance of the same form of worship. Had the compilers been as honestly disposed to do justice to William Penn, as they seem anxious to procure some authority to support the opinion, that it is immaterial what doctrines we hold, or whether any, and that none should be separated from the communion of Christian

Society, however erroneous their notions may be; they would have finished out the paragraph which they began to quote, and not suppressed the closing sentence, where he explains what he is alluding to. We shall quote the two preceding paragraphs, and the whole of that which they have mutilated. The parts they extract, will, as usual, be enclosed in brackets, designated with a hand.

“But, methinks I hear a stout objection, and 'tis this: “At this rate you will overthrow *all church discipline*, all *censure of errors*: if no man or men can determine.”—My answer is ready and short. No scripture church discipline, is hereby oppugned or weakened: let not the sentence, end in *violence* upon the conscience, unconvinced: Let who will, expound or determine, so it be according to true church discipline; which can be exercised, on them only, who have willingly joined themselves in that covenant of union; and which proceeds only to a separation from the rest, a disavowing or disowning, and that only in case of falling from *principles* or practices *once received*; or about known trespasses: But never, to any *corporal* or *pecuniary punishment*, the two arms of antichrist, or rather of the great beast which carries the whore.

“But let us observe what sort of church government the Apostle recommends. Avoid foolish questions, and genealogies and contentions, and strivings about the law, for they are unprofitable and vain. A man that is *an heretic*, after the first and second admonition, *reject*, knowing that he that is such, is *subverted and sinneth*, being condemned of (or in) himself.” Then follows the paragraph selected by the compilers, viz: [“It's very remarkable, first, that this great Apostle, instead of exhorting Titus to stand upon niceties, and sacrifice men's natural comforts and enjoyments, for opinions of religion, enjoins him to shun disputes about them; leaving the people to their own thoughts and apprehensions in those matters, as reputed the loss of peace in *striving*, greater than the gain that could arise from such an unity and conformity. Which exactly agrees with another passage of his, Let us, therefore, as many as be perfect be thus minded, and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you.”] He did not say, you shall be fined, pillaged, excommunicated and flung into prison, if ye be not of our mind.”—Vol. i. pages 804, 805.

It will at once appear, from this extract, that William Penn, so far from reprobating, *cordially approves* of the exercise of that christian discipline, whose object is, to preserve an orderly conversation, and sound christian faith, among the members of the same society. Our primitive Friends suffered greatly from the cruel execution of oppressive laws, enacted to compel a conformity to the established religion of England; and it was not until *many years after* this essay *was written*, that the act for tolerating dissenters was passed. It is to the cruel finings, imprisonments, whippings, and other *pecuniary and corporal punishments* which they endured for non-conformity, that W. P. alludes. He was too great a friend to the preservation of right order, too well versed in the great truths of the christian faith, and too intimately acquainted with the nature and design of religious compacts, to advocate a doctrine that would tole-

rate within the pale of a christian society, persons who denied and impugned those very fundamental christian principles, which they had associated to propagate and maintain.

Every religious society has certain principles and doctrines which it holds sacred, and necessary to be believed, as being sanctioned by the spirit of God, and the revelation of Holy Scripture. A conformity to these doctrines and the code of discipline which it has instituted, are indispensable to the rightful enjoyment of the privilege of membership. They are the terms upon which membership is granted, and upon which only it can be maintained. Preposterous, indeed, would it be, to suppose that an individual, after having voluntarily embraced those principles, and gained admission upon those terms, should claim it as his right to continue to exercise and enjoy the privileges of communion, after he had openly denied and rejected those fundamental principles, on profession of which he was received a member; and for the maintenance of which the society was formed.

The very act of renouncing the doctrines or discipline of the Society, is a virtual relinquishment of the right of membership, as completely so, as a refusal to conform to the stipulated terms of any civil association. And to disown such is no oppression—no persecution—no infringement of liberty of conscience; since those, who so dissent from the body of consistent professors, are at liberty to withdraw and to attach themselves to any other denomination, whose *principles*, or in other words, whose terms of communion, more nearly accord with those which they have recently imbibed.

The compilers seem determined to secure the authority of William Penn, in support of their views, without regard to the means by which they obtain it. On page 74, they give another garbled extract from his writings, with a view of enforcing the same dis-organizing sentiments as the last. To defend William Penn from the charge, they would allege against him, we have only to quote his own words fairly. The part extracted by the compilers is in brackets with an index. He says:

“Now it may be expected, I should here set down what sort of authority is exercised by this people, upon such members of their Society as correspond not in their lives with their profession, and that are refractory to *this good and wholesome order*, settled among them; and the rather, because they have not wanted their reproach and suffering from some tongues upon this occasion, in a plentiful manner.

“The power they exercise, is such as *Christ has given to his own people to the end of the world*, in the persons of his disciples, viz: to oversee, exhort, reprove, and after long suffering and waiting upon the disobedient and refractory, ‘to *disown* them as any more of their communion, or that they will any longer stand charged in the sight and judgment of God or men, with their conversation or behaviour, *as one of them*, until they repent.’ The subject matter about which this authority, in any of the foregoing branches of it is exercised, is, first, in relation to common and general practice: and secondly, about those things that more strictly refer to *their own*

character and profession, and distinguish them from all other professors of christianity; avoiding two extremes upon which many split; viz. persecution and libertinism. A coercive power to whip people into the temple; that such as *will not conform*, though against faith and conscience, shall be punished in their persons or estates; or leaving all loose and at large as to practice, unaccountable to all but God and the magistrate. To which *hurtful extreme*, nothing has more contributed than the abuse of church power, by such as suffer their passions and private interests to prevail with them to carry it to *outward force and corporal punishment*; a practice they have been taught to dislike by their extreme sufferings, as well as their known principle for an universal liberty of conscience."

"On the other hand, they *equally dislike an independency* in Society; an unaccountableness in practice and conversation, *to the terms of their own communion*, and to those that are the members of it. [They distinguish between imposing any practice that immediately regards faith or worship, (which is never to be done, nor suffered, or submitted unto) and requiring christian compliance with those methods that only respect church business in its more civil part and concern, and that regard the discreet and orderly maintenance of the character of the Society, as a sober and religious community.] In short, what is for the promotion of holiness and charity, that men may practice what they profess, *live up to their own principles*, and not be at liberty to give the lie to their own profession without rebuke. They *compel none to them, but OBLIGE those that are of them, to walk suitably, or they are denied by them*: that is all the mark, they set upon them, and the power they exercise or judge a christian Society can exercise, upon those that are members of it."—Preface to George Fox's Journal, pages 33, 34.

It is easy to perceive from the ungenerous and unfair manner in which the paragraph of William Penn is mutilated by the compilers of the pamphlet, that they were conscious at the very time they were quoting it, that if William Penn's sentiments were fully and fairly exhibited, they would operate directly against them, and well may they blush with confusion and shame, at the unholy doctrines, and the unrighteous means, by which they have sought to traduce the christian reputation of this great and good man.

The sentiments of William Penn as expressed in the extracts we have inserted, define clearly the nature and extent of the discipline of the Society of Friends. First, it is a christian authority, instituted by Christ Jesus himself, to oversee, exhort, reprove, and after due labour to reclaim the offender, it proving ineffectual, to *disown* from their religious communion, consonant with the expression of our blessed Lord, "Let him be to thee as an heathen man, or as a publican." Second, as regards its extent; it includes not only *general practice*, but what is *particularly to be noticed* in this case, as it seems to be that which the compilers are most anxious to overturn; also, "those things that more strictly refer to their own character and *profession, and distinguish them from all other professors of christianity*; avoid-

ing two extremes upon which many split, viz. *persecution and libertinism.*"

What then are those things, which distinguish the profession of the Society of Friends from that of all other professors of christianity. Most certainly, they are their doctrines and principles; those "substantial truths and realities of religion" which the authors of the preface to this very pamphlet, tell us, "they sought for in humility, and embraced." To a denial or direliction from these, William Penn declares the exercise of the discipline is to be extended, and in enforcing its salutary regulations, he cautions them to avoid two extremes, persecution and libertinism. Now it is important for us to know what he means by these two words; and we are happy in having his own definition at hand. Persecution he defines, as the exercise of a *coercive power to whip* people into the temple, or punishing them in their persons or estates for nonconformity in matters of faith and conscience. Libertinism, is leaving all loose and at large; an unaccountableness, in practice and conversation, to the terms of their own communion, and those that are consistent and orderly members of it; which he declares the Quakers *equally dislike*, with persecution, or the *application of outward force, and corporal punishment.* This libertinism then, which the primitive Friends so disliked, is the very thing which the followers of Elias Hicks contend for; and to support which, our compilers have garbled these two extracts from William Penn; crying out that disownment for doctrines, is persecution. But William Penn thought not so. He states it as a legitimate subject, upon which to exercise the discipline, and where the party will not conform "to the terms of their own communion," they are to be disowned; which he is so far from considering as persecution, that he calls it "good and wholesome order." He says they *compel none to them*, they *oblige* none who *are* with them to remain; if they are not united in their principles, they leave them at liberty to join any other communion, or to withdraw from all, as they may please, but on the other hand, he says as positively that "they *oblige* those that *are of them*, to *walk suitably*, or they are *denied by them.*" As the compilers are so much attached to the authority of Penn, as to be determined to press him into their service at the hazard of all honest principle, we could wish they would conform to the excellent regulations which he has here set down; it would be to their own credit, and greatly to the benefit and order, and good government of the Society.

Such has been the order and discipline of the Society since the earliest period of its existence. Though they have not demanded of their members a subscription to any particular articles of faith, yet they have always expected those who hold communion with them, unfeignedly to believe in the doctrines of the christian religion. The following rule of discipline issued by the Yearly Meeting in the year 1694, will confirm what we say.

"If there be any such *gross errors, false doctrines*, or mistakes held by any professing truth, as are either against the validity of Christ's sufferings, blood, resurrection, ascension, or glory in the heavens, according as they are set forth in the scriptures; or any

ways tending to the denial of the heavenly Man, Christ; such persons ought to be diligently instructed and admonished by faithful friends, and not to be exposed by any to public reproach; and where the error proceeds from ignorance and darkness of their understanding, they ought the more meekly and gently to be informed: But if *any shall wilfully persist in error in point of faith*, after being duly informed, then *such to be further dealt with according to gospel order*; that the truth, church, or body of Christ, may not suffer by any particular *pretended* member that *is so corrupt*."—See Extracts.

This single quotation of the rule of discipline, made at so early a period after the rise of the Society, is a conclusive answer to all the assertions of the friends of Elias Hicks, that he and they are one in doctrine with the early Quakers. This rule shows clearly that the primitive Friends would have disowned any and all of their *pretended* members, who persisted in holding the notions which Elias Hicks now promulgates. We have other rules and advices of a similar nature, which have continued in force from that time to the present, of which we could give extracts if necessary.

We have now gone through with the quotations from William Penn, and have showed that in various instances the compilers of the pamphlet have unjustly altered and perverted his meaning, in order to present him as holding sentiments coincident with those of Elias Hicks. But we trust that we have also proved in the clearest manner, that in every instance where he has been permitted to speak for himself, he has denied and repelled the injurious accusation. We have seen him declaring repeatedly his unshaken belief in the Holy Three that bear record in heaven, in the Divinity and manhood, the miraculous conception, holy life, and propitiatory death of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and likewise in the authenticity and divine authority of Holy Scripture. He has again and again asserted his firm faith in all these particulars, in the most solemn and unequivocal manner, "as knowing that he must give an account unto God." When charged by his illiberal opponents with entertaining doubts respecting these important and holy doctrines, which Elias Hicks now impugns, he uniformly repelled it with honest indignation, as a most false and malicious libel. To associate his name at the present time with the same principles, to pervert or alter his language in order to make him speak those sentiments which he then denied with abhorrence, is certainly most injuriously casting a shade over the memory of a sound and practical christian, and fixing an unmerited stigma upon his reputation and religion.

CHAPTER II.

Remarks upon the Extracts made by the Compilers, from the works of
STEPHEN CRISP.

On the 25th page of the pamphlet, we find a quotation of two lines, said to be taken from Stephen Crisp's works, new edition, page 125. It stands thus, "*The* light, wherewith *all* are enlightened, is the life of Jesus; John i. 4. which he hath given a ransom for man." On page 33, we find what is intended to be the same quotation, extended to about four lines; in the beginning of which, the compilers have made a slight variation, so that it reads—" *This* light wherewith *we* are enlightened, is the life of Jesus, which he hath given a ransom for man. And that was not natural, as some foolishly imagine; for if it were natural, it could not be a ransom for man out of sin."—p. 125.

Thus in two quotations the compilers give the same sentence differently; in one it is *The* light wherewith *all* are enlightened—in the other, *This* light wherewith *we* are enlightened; but what is more singular, neither of them are correct: since Stephen Crisp has it, *This* light wherewith *thou art* enlightened, &c.

Besides this alteration in two instances, the extract is made with great unfairness, as it begins after a semicolon, omitting the copulative conjunction "and;" which connects both the words and the sense with what precedes; and the second quotation on page 33, of their pamphlet, closes at a semicolon, just where Stephen Crisp is proceeding to explain his views more fully. We shall quote the passages more at length, that the reader may have an opportunity of understanding the subject upon which the author is treating; and also of noticing the manner in which the compilers have mutilated his sentences. The parts which they have extracted are enclosed in brackets, designated with a hand.

"And therefore consider this, that every good and perfect gift cometh from above, from the Father of Lights and Spirits, who would not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should turn and live. And therefore hath he out of his infinite love, and tender mercies to the sons of men, prepared a way to draw nigh unto them, even while they are in their sins, which he doth not but through Jesus Christ, the mediator of the new covenant, whom he hath freely given to be a light unto the dark world; and that he should enlighten every one that cometh into the world, John i. 9. of which number thou art one, whoever thou art, and art enlightened by Christ, though thou be yet darkness thyself as the Ephesians once were; yet the light shineth in thy darkness, or else there would not be two contrary natures and seeds found

working in thee, as there are; and [this light wherewith
 "thou art enlightened, is the life of Jesus, John i, 4. which he hath
 "given, a ransom for man. And that was not natural, as some fool-
 "ishly imagine; for if it were natural, it could not be a ransom for
 "man out of sin;] for the sin to be natural, and that which re-
 proves it natural, is contrary to the apostle, who said, they two that
 warred in the creature were contrary, and called the one flesh, or
 natural, and the other spirit or spiritual; and Christ Jesus called
 that which should reprove the world of sin, the Spirit of Truth, and
 Antichrist and his ministers call it, a natural insufficient light, &c.
 But know this, thou that art enquiring, that that in thee which doth
 make manifest things to thee that are reproveable, that is the light
 wherewith Christ Jesus hath enlightened thee withal, as the apostle
 of Christ said in his epistle to the Ephesians, v. 13, 14."

It will be seen by the first part of our quotation, that Stephen
 Crisp has made a full acknowledgment of his belief in that means
 of salvation, which God hath been pleased to ordain through his
 son Jesus Christ; for he asserts that he hath "out of his infinite
 love and tender mercies to the sons of men, prepared a way to
 draw nigh unto them, *even while they are yet in their sins*, which he
 doth not, but through Jesus Christ, the Mediator of the new cove-
 nant, whom he hath freely given, to be a light unto the dark world."
 Here is sufficient testimony in the very same paragraph from
 which the compilers have quoted, to show that the author was far
 from denying or doubting the great truths of the Christian religion.

The garbled extracts inserted in the pamphlet, appear to be pre-
 sented to the public with the intention of conveying the idea that
 the author believed in no outward sacrifice for sin. It must be ob-
 vious, however, upon the slightest consideration of the text, that
 Stephen Crisp was treating of quite another thing, than the propi-
 tiatory offering of Jesus Christ. He uses the word ransom, to sig-
 nify that measure of the Holy Spirit, which is given to every man,
 to redeem him out from under the dominion of his own sinful propen-
 sities. Hence it is, that he speaks of the ransom *reproving* for
 sin,—from which it is most apparent, he was not then alluding to
 the great sacrifice, but the inward work.

George Keith, who had apostatized from the doctrine and disci-
 pline of the early Quakers, and become a bitter opponent, and a
 traducer of their principles, published a book entitled "A Serious
 Call to the Quakers, &c." in which he adduces this same passage
 which our compilers have quoted from Stephen Crisp, to prove that
 the author held those very principles, which they would now have
 us to infer from their extracts. To George Keith's Serious Call, an
 answer was returned by several Friends, entitled, "A Serious Ex-
 amination, &c." from which we take the following: After noticing
 a variation which George Keith has made in quoting it, they say,
 1st. "In him, in Christ the Word, was life, and the life was the light
 of men," John i. 4. In George Keith's quoting this among mon-
 strous doctrines or vile errors, he has condemned the Divine doc-
 trine of John the Evangelist. 2ndly. That this Life or Light of

Jesus Christ, is not natural, but spiritual and divine, is no vile error, but true doctrine. 3d. Which he hath *given* a ransom for man ; is true in that sense, as given to guide, and actually to redeem man out of darkness, sin, and all iniquity, for so Christ doth lead and deliver all true believers. 4th. Man's redemption and salvation hath respect, *both to Christ's suffering and giving himself a ransom for all men, by his ONE OFFERING WITHOUT MEN*, and also his work in men, in redeeming them from all iniquity, which is not effected without their believing in his Light."—p. 20. Edit. 1707.

The following quotations will serve to show the scriptural soundness of Stephen Crisp's faith. In the postscript to his essay, entitled "An Alarm Sounded in the borders of Spiritual Egypt;" after stating that it is the appearance of Christ Jesus that has brought professing Christians off from their sins, which they could not do themselves ; that it is the grace of God that leads to perfection ; that it is Christ, who is the unfailing preserver and helper of all those that trust in him, and that he only, is able to keep them from falling, and to present them faultless before the throne of his glory, with exceeding joy. He adds—

"So here you may see that the bringing to the state of perfection, and the keeping from falling from it again, is both the work of Christ ; and yet this is not a perfect salvation ; for *this does not put away the former sins.*" But thirdly, "Whoever comes to perfect salvation, he comes to know Christ to be an offering for sin, and to obtain reconciliation with God, and forgiveness of his former sins : for *all the holy conversation and perfection of Life*, can be counted no more but his duty ; and therefore he cannot obtain remission of one of his former sins ; but those that confess their sins and forsake them, such come to forgiveness by Jesus Christ, and come to know his blood cleansing them from all their former sins ; and so they come to perfect salvation by grace, not by works, but by faith, that works in the love of God unto obedience ; without which, faith is but dead, and makes no man saved ; but those that have this true faith and hope in them, they purify themselves as he is pure, 1 John iii. 5. And he that has not this hope, does not purify himself, neither does he believe that he can do it ; and by this we know the true believers from the false, and by this sinners are made manifest, that cannot stand in the congregation of the righteous. Psal. i. 5.

"So now let all the pleaders for sin, stop their mouths forever, and let the devil stand for himself and plead his own cause ; and henceforth do not despise and revile the innocent, (that are travailing and striving after perfection, with a faith to obtain it) that *they think to be saved by their own works* ; for we hope for no other salvation, but that which is in and by Jesus Christ, the eternal Son of God, who is the first born of every creature, that brings many sons and daughters unto glory, but not by leaving them in their sins ; but his name is Jesus, and he saves people from their sins."—p. 229.

This extract will evince that the author, though a firm believer in the necessity of the new birth unto righteousness, was equally

firm and clear, in his belief of the virtue and efficacy of that precious sacrifice, which Christ Jesus made of himself for sin.

On page 70 of the compilers' pamphlet, they have given us an extract from Stephen Crisp's "Description of the Church of Scotland," wherein he is opposing the notion of three distinct and separate persons in one Godhead. The quotation proves nothing more than his denial of this doctrine, and although the compilers have italicised the words "the Christ," as if to insinuate his denial of the divinity of Jesus Christ, yet no such inference can justly be drawn from them. The following extracts from his Sermons will sufficiently show that the author was far from denying either his divinity, manhood, or atonement.

"The same Almighty power, that said in the creation, 'let there be light, and it was so, he hath shined into our hearts, and the way by which he hath done so, is through the Mediator, through Jesus Christ the Redeemer, in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwells'—1692, Vol. i. page 91, edition 1822.

"When there is no hope of atonement and reconciliation with God, by all those offerings under the law, he tells you of *one offering of the Son of God himself*, through the Eternal Spirit, by which he became a propitiation: for thus will it do, if I believe that Christ offered a holy offering to the Father for my sins, *I believe he offered his body*; and that through the Eternal Spirit, that he might be a propitiation for sin, and take away sin, and have power over sin and death, and conquer death and darkness. The apostle carries the matter further—You must come to the inward work of this outward offering, this eternal offering, that was *in due time* offered to God. You must come to know the operations of it, by the sprinkling of the heart from an evil conscience: so that there was to be an *applicatory faith*, for the offering of that. The way to a Saviour was not made by man, any more than the way of salvation by Christ, was found out by man: any more than the application of the *benefits* is effected by man"—page 123, Vol. i. 1692.

"This is no new doctrine. We see the new and living way; it was an old way to old Christians, and a new way to the new: and so, a thousand years hence, if the world last so long, men will see that they cannot do any thing pleasing to God, but as they are gathered into Christ. They will see that *their own righteousness, works and doings, will avail them nothing at all*. This is all laid at the feet of Jesus, whom God hath exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour, to be Lord and King"—page 129, Vol. i. 1692.

Speaking of the works wrought by Satan, he says—"Why doth not God destroy those works, when he is Almighty and able to do it? Very true, God is so, but he hath offered to mankind, through the Son of his love, a way and means, whereby man may come to be purged and cleansed from the evil that the devil hath wrought in him, and may come to be reconciled to God. God hath not chosen the way of coercion and force, and to work altogether by irresistible power, that man shall go to heaven, whether he will or not. There was no force used for his going to hell and darkness, but it was the choice of his will; the devil could not have forced him,

and led him away out of covenant with God ; he could not compel him to break the holy command of God ; but the devil tempted him and he yielded to the temptation, and now man is driven out of the presence of God ; yet God hath found out a way for the sons and daughters of men to turn again to him. What ! by force and coercion, and irresistible power ? No ; but the scriptures saith, He hath offered faith and salvation to all men : *He hath freely given the Son of his love, out of his own bosom, who, making himself an offering for sin, hath presented a way and means for man's returning again to God.* How doth God present Christ to us ? He presents him to the view of every one's mind, to the understanding of every soul ; he offers and presents him for salvation to the ends of the earth. There is a damnation come in by man's being subject to Satan ; but salvation comes in, by his being subject to Christ ; as damnation came in by his being defiled, so salvation came in by his being cleansed. As the devil is the defiler, so Christ is the cleanser, and man is the object upon which both do work ; and they that have been defiled and corrupted, *as we all have*, by the unclean spirit, can any of us give a reason why we should not be cleansed by the Holy Spirit ?

“We have lost our right to heaven by sin and transgression in the first Adam ; and can any give a reason, why we should not be restored and redeemed by Jesus Christ, the second Adam ? *No reason can be given for our redemption, but that God is free in his love, and Christ in his offering : he hath offered himself a sacrifice for sin : every priest hath something to offer, this man, the Man Christ Jesus, offered himself, through the Eternal Spirit, a sacrifice for sin ; and now the sacrifice is offered, and a door is opened, and a new and living way consecrated through the vail, that is to say his flesh*”—pages 143, 144, 145. 1692.

“God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in times past, unto the fathers, by the prophets ; hath in these last days, spoken to us by his Son. But where is his Son ? you will say. He is in heaven. But though HE is the High and Lofty One that inhabits eternity yet he dwells with meek, humble, and contrite hearts, that tremble at his word. If I be one of the number of those that tremble at God's word, I have that promise that he will come home to me, and dwell with me. It is well for thee, if the overruling power of God, hath prevailed upon thee, that thou canst be willing to be at God's disposal, and say, Lord, what wouldst thou have me to do ?”—Page 160. 1692.

“To the Lord I leave you, to his favour and protection I commit you. Remember that there is no salvation but by Jesus Christ ; and none to be had by Christ, till you come to believe in him. To him that searcheth the heart and trieth the reins, that pardoneth iniquity, transgression, and sin, for the sake of Christ Jesus the Mediator, to Him I do commit you, not doubting that he who hath begun a good work in you, will at last complete and finish it, to his own praise and your salvation.”—Page 362, 363. 1691.

“The institution of the Christian Religion was for this purpose, that holiness and righteousness might be brought forth in the earth ;

that God, *through his Son Jesus Christ*, might take delight in the sons and daughters of men, that they might be reconciled to him; for that which the law could not do by reason of its weakness, God hath had a *purpose to do by his Son*; and to *Him he gave all power in heaven and earth*, that thereby he might be enabled to perform the great work of God in establishing righteousness, and in bringing forth a holy people, to serve a Holy God. This is the great blessing that is come to us, and to all mankind, *through our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*; that came to turn every one from the evil of his ways. That is the way and method by which our Lord Jesus accomplished the end of his coming, and the will of his heavenly Father. Moses and all his washings, and offerings, and sacrifices, could not make clean and purge the conscience; and by all his offerings and sacrifices he could not reconcile us to God: *but Jesus by his once offering himself*, did forever perfect them that are sanctified, and by one offering reconciled us to the Father, and so brings forth a holy generation unto God, through regeneration and the sanctification of the Spirit."—Pages 386, 387. 1692.

Again, in the second volume; "The Apostle alludes to this baptism; for he speaks in a figure of the eight persons that were saved in Noah's ark; then he brings down the allegory to Christian baptism; not only the baptism of John, the forerunner of Christ, who preached of Christ, but to the Christian baptism itself: by the like figure, whereof baptism now saveth us, saith the Apostle, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience. What doth he mean by baptism saving us? He means the answer of a good conscience towards God, through the resurrection of Christ from the dead; so that Christian baptism did bring along with it, the cleansing and putting away of all sin out of the conscience, that might bring them under doubts and scruples; and then there is an arising of Jesus the Saviour, in the conscience, the mediator, that bought them, to answer for them in the sight of God, for if people be conscious of sin, and do leave off their sin, *this doth not yet cleanse the conscience*, for there still remains a conscience of sin: *'tis not the leaving off of our sin that makes our atonement with God*, or that *expiates our guilt*, or doth away the guilt of the sins that we have committed; but there must be a forsaking and a leaving off of sin, by the virtue and power of the spirit, by which we are not only enabled to leave off sin, but are guided and directed to the Mediator, whose blood alone reconcileth us to God, and cleanseth us from all sin.

"*If I should never commit a sin while I live, it is not this simply in itself, that will make me have the answer of a good conscience in the sight of God*; for there remains the guilt of sin, contracted in the days of unbelief, which is a bar and hindrance, that none can approach the holy God, but *in the atonement and salvation that comes by Jesus Christ*; for all that believe and obey the gospel are *accepted in Christ, and upon the account of Christ's precious blood*, that cleanseth us from all sin and unrighteousness. Whom doth it cleanse? Those only that forsake their sin, and who, by his power, are brought to a

holy life, they, by the virtue of his power, and the cleansing of his blood, come to have their former sins removed from them, as far as the east is from the west."—Pages 53, 54. 1687.

It needs no argument to prove that Stephen Crisp did not coincide with the dogmas of Elias Hicks. These extracts strongly assert his full belief in the divinity and propitiatory sacrifice of our blessed Saviour, Jesus Christ, and the whole volume of his sermons is fraught with those very doctrines which are so unequivocally denied by Elias Hicks.

CHAPTER III.

Remarks upon the Quotations from THOMAS STORY.

THE compilers of the pamphlet have inserted about three lines, on their twenty-fifth page, which are marked as a quotation from the Journal of Thomas Story, page 385. After a careful examination, it appears that no such expressions are to be found there. Whether this false reference was made, purposely to lead the reader away from a very able argument by that excellent man, upon the character, divinity, and glorious mission of Jesus Christ, as well as the general fundamental principles of the Christian religion, we cannot determine; certain it is, however, that their reference does not lead to the quotation.

If we turn to page 333 of Thomas Story's Journal, we find there a part of the sentence printed by the compilers; the remainder they have added themselves; thus most unjustly making him avow a sentiment, which it is plain from the context he never intended to imply. To render their garbling and interpolation more clearly apparent, we shall quote what they have printed, viz. "*The prophecies concerning the advent of the Messiah was fulfilled to the Jews; to whom alone he was sent, and appeared in the days of his flesh.*" The great length of Thomas Story's argument, (eight folio pages,) prevents our inserting the whole, though we sincerely wish it may be carefully perused by every person interested in the subject; the following extract will illustrate his views. The part enclosed in brackets, with a hand, is that which the compilers have taken out.

"And the goodness and mercy of God appeareth still further in this, that in the fulness of time, many ages after that first promise, the Lord added *other promises to mankind, both Jews and gentiles, even unto all nations, the whole posterity of Adam*; when, unto the Jew he saith, Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. And unto *both the Jew and gentile*, he saith, behold my servant, whom I uphold, mine elect in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him, he shall bring forth judgment to the *gentiles*. Again—I, the Lord, have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, *for a light of the gentiles*. To open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness, out of the prison house. Which [was fulfilled unto "the Jews, to whom alone he was sent and appeared, in the days of "his flesh,] where it is said, the people who sat in darkness, saw a great light, and to them who sat in the region and shadow of death, light is sprung up.

“ And that it might be certainly known, in the fulness of time unto all mankind, who this *sacred person* is, and what is the manner of his coming and appearance *both to Jew and gentile*; he was to be made manifest unto the Jews first, under the name and character of Jesus, (a Saviour;) and being anointed of God, *with all the divine indwelling fulness*, is thereby called Christ; and under both, is called Jesus Christ, the anointed Saviour; proposed as the object of faith, *unto all nations*; first unto the Jews in the flesh, as born of the virgin; and secondly, *unto the gentiles*; as the true light, who lighteth every man who cometh into the world.

“ First—the testimony of good old Simeon, concerning him, through the Holy Ghost, is, that he is a light to lighten *the gentiles*: and in that respect, *their* light and salvation, according to the promise of the covenant of God aforegoing.

“ Secondly—the evidence of John, where he is full and express, saying, In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. In him was life, and the life was the light of men. That was the true light, which lighteth every man who cometh into the world: and the Word was made (or assumed,) flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth. And of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace.

“ Thirdly—the witness of Christ himself, where he saith, I am the light of the world, he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life. Again—Jesus said unto them, yet a little while is the light with you; walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you: for he that walketh in darkness, knoweth not whither he goeth. While ye have light, believe in the light, that ye may be the children of light.

“ And as the Father hath promised, and offered his Son, as he is that light, and as his new and everlasting covenant with mankind, in order to their restoration and establishment; not of works, but of life; so whoever will enter into this covenant with God, must first believe in him whom God hath sent; and in the way and manner in which he hath sent him, according to his promises.

“ Now a covenant is not on one side only, but on two, at the least; and, therefore, God, who is divine Eternal Love, infinite in goodness and mercy, is pleased of his own nature and love to mankind, thus to send his Son, the Lord Jesus Christ into the world; who by a *voluntary death* upon the tree of the cross, according to the *fore-determined counsel and purpose of the Father*, declared his mercy, and free pardon of the sins of the whole world; upon terms suiting the state, reason, and understanding of mankind: that is to say, upon faith in God the Father of all, and in *Jesus Christ the Son of God*, (as I have already declared,) and repentance from dead works, as the reasonable and necessary terms required of mankind, on our side or part of this covenant; that we may be restored to the knowledge of God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, his Son; and made capable of being united unto God, through *Christ the Mediator* between God and man, in this covenant; by and through whom, we are brought into it, and stand therein stedfast and immoveable forever.

“ We must then receive the Saviour in the way in which he is sent and proposed unto us; *not only as he is offered upon the cross for the expiation of the sins that are past*; but also as he is the divine light, enlightening our minds and understandings, as directed by Christ himself, where he saith, While ye have light, believe in the light, that ye may be the children of light, that is, children of God, who is that Light. So that as Adam fell from the true knowledge of God, and sense of his divine love, presence, goodness, and other attributes through unbelief; we his posterity after the flesh, may all arise and be restored by faith in Christ, the second Adam, the Lord from Heaven, that quickening Spirit; not into the animal life which by nature we already have, and in which we are averse to God, and all his ways; but unto life eternal, that we may all know what that word meaneth, As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. And as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.”—Journal, pages 332, 333, 334.

It will be seen from this quotation that the words “ *The prophecies concerning the advent of the Messiah.*” with which the compilers begin their *preteuled* quotation, are entirely of *their own making*, and are not to be found in Thomas Story’s argument. It is important too, to observe their design in thus foisting in, words which Thomas Story never wrote there, and the meaning which they thus put upon the sentence. The fair inference from it, as given by them is, that *all the prophecies* relative to the advent of the Son of God, were fulfilled to the Jews *only*; and thus to do away the necessity of the Gentile world believing in him, or the possibility of their deriving any benefit from his glorious manifestation in the flesh. Now this is not only, not the meaning of Thomas Story, but directly contradicts his own declarations, in the very same paragraph from which they have carved out their few words.

In the beginning of that paragraph he says, “ other promises were added, to *all mankind, both Jews and Gentiles, even unto all nations, the whole posterity of Adam.*”—and where he says Christ was sent unto the Jews alone, he expressly declares his meaning to be as regards his personal appearance, alluding to Christ’s declaration, no doubt, that he was not sent, but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel, which plainly implies, as to his bodily appearance. It is, therefore obvious, that the compilers have put down language of *their own*, as being Thomas Story’s, and have thereby forged in his name, a direct contradiction of what he has asserted in the very same paragraph. Surely, if such liberties as these are to be taken by transcribers, the most christian author, may be made to utter the most pernicious sentiments, and to deny every truth in the religion of Jesus Christ. Even the Bible itself, might then be safely adduced as the best authority for Deism or Atheism.

The language of Thomas Story, which we have quoted, is widely different from Elias Hicks’ denial of the divinity and sacrifice of our blessed Lord, and how unworthy a subterfuge is it, to *alter and add*

to the words of so christian a writer, in order to make him speak the language of unbelief.

On page 73, of the compilers' pamphlet, we are furnished with an extract from a sermon preached by Thomas Story, in which he treats upon the necessity of cultivating that divine charity, which our blessed Lord enjoined upon his disciples in these words—"this is my commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you." He tells us, that under the influences of this heavenly love, we shall not personally hate those, who may differ from us in religious opinion; but that as God loved us, while we were in sin, and was kind toward us, so we should be, toward those whose opinions we may consider erroneous; yet, he adds, we may and ought to persuade one another in love, with a single eye to the conviction, conversion, and salvation of those with whom we reason. With these sentiments, we do most cordially unite:—we consider them coincident with that divine command, "love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you." It must, however, be remembered, that the same divine love which can only enable us to do this, does as certainly, prevent us from uniting with wicked men, or joining ourselves to their society. It leads us to pray for the persons, but to abhor and to protest against their evil practices. It enjoins it as an imperative command, "come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

While, therefore, we earnestly desire to fulfil the important precept of loving all, we are far from thinking, that our blessed Lord enjoined it upon his followers, to have *unity and church fellowship, with all*. Those, who, by the temptations of a cunning adversary, have been allured into the mazes of unbelief, and are denying the Lord that bought them, we can truly commiserate, well knowing how painful and comfortless a path they tread—we mourn over their errors, and under the influence of this divine charity, we desire ever to pray earnestly, for their restoration to the faith of the gospel of Jesus Christ; but we cannot, nay, we dare not, unite with them in their unbelief. We feel it our incumbent duty, in meekness and christian boldness to expose their errors, not only to clear our own hands of the evil, but also to free our christian profession from the reproach.

CHAPTER IV.

Of the compilers' quotations from the works of ISAAC PENNINGTON

THE first quotation which the compilers have made from the works of this faithful servant of Jesus Christ, is to be found on page 27 of their pamphlet. It is extracted from a short essay, entitled, "An Incitation to Professors, seriously to consider, whether *they* or *we*, fail in the *true acknowledgement*, and *owning* of the Christ, *which died at Jerusalem.*" From an essay headed with such a title, it was not to be supposed that much could be extracted, which would go to prove that the author *denied* Christ; and accordingly the quotation made by the compilers, so far from proving I. Pennington to coincide in the unbelief of Elias Hicks, evinces in the clearest manner, his full faith both in the manhood and Godhead of our blessed Lord. He commences the essay thus:—

"We who are commonly called Quakers, being a people whom the Lord hath gathered, out of the wanderings, out of the many professions, (out of the several scattered estates and conditions wherein his eye pitied us, and his love found us out,) into a measure of the eternal rest; where we have found that life, that power, than manifestation of the Eternal Spirit, and that redeeming virtue which we never were before distinctly acquainted with, I say having tasted of this, having known this, having felt this, and come to a real enjoyment of it, in some degree in our several measures; we could not possibly conceal this treasure, but in bowels of love, (and in the movings of the life and power of the spirit) have been drawn to testify of it to them who are left behind, grovelling under the burden of corruption, and crying out because of the sin and bondage from the powers of darkness; who have in a mist withheld their eyes from beholding that living virtue which is able to save, (and doth save, blessed be his name,) therefrom. Now this we have often found; that this our testimony hath not been received in the same spirit and love, wherein it hath gone forth; but the enemy, (by his subtilty,) hath raised up jealousies concerning us, and prejudices against us, as if *we denied the scriptures* and ordinances of God, and *that Christ that died at Jerusalem*; professing him *only in words*, (to win upon others by) but *denying him in reality and substance.*

"To clear this latter, (for my heart is only at this present, drawn out concerning that,) we have *solemnly professed in the sight of the Lord God*, (who hath given us the knowledge of his Son in life and power,) these two things.

"First, That we do really, *in our hearts, own that Christ*, who came *in the fulness of time*, in that prepared body, to do the Father's will (his coming into the world, doctrine, miracles, sufferings, death,

resurrection, &c.) in plainness and simplicity of heart, according as it is expressed in the letter of the scriptures.

“Secondly, That we own no other Christ than that, nor hold forth no other thing for Christ, but Him who then appeared and was made manifest in the flesh.”—Vol. iii. pages 58, 59.

The following is the quotation made by the compilers, viz. [“Now that professors generally, have not received their knowledge of Christ from the spirit, or from scriptures opened in the spirit, (and so know not the thing, but only such a relation of the thing, as man’s reasoning part may drink in from the letter of the scriptures) is manifest by this, in that they are not able in spirit and understanding to distinguish the thing itself, from the garment wherewith it was clothed, though the scriptures be very express therein. Speak of Christ according to a relation of the letter; there they can say somewhat, but come to the substance, come to the spirit of the thing, come to the thing itself, there they stutter and stammer, and show plainly that they know not what it is.—Now the scriptures do expressly distinguish between Christ and the garment which he wore, between him that came, and the body in which he came, between the substance which was veiled, and the veil which veiled it. “Lo! I come; a body hast thou prepared me.” There is plainly HE, and the body in which HE came. There was the outward vessel, and the inward life. This we certainly know, and can never call the bodily garment *Christ*, but that which appeared and dwelt in the body. Now if ye indeed know the Christ of God, tell us plainly what that is, which appeared in the body?—Whether *that* was not the Christ before it took up the body, after it took up the body, and forever? And then their confining of Christ to that body, plainly manifesteth that they want the knowledge of him in spirit. For Christ is the Son of the Father; he is the Infinite Eternal Being, one with the Father, and with the Spirit, and cannot be divided from either; cannot be any where, where they are not, nor can be excluded from any place where they are. He may take up a body, and appear in it; but cannot be confined to be no where else but there; no, not at the very time while he is there. Christ while he was here on earth, yet was not excluded from being in heaven with the Father, at the very same time; as he himself said concerning himself, ‘the Son of Man, which is in heaven.’ John iii. 13. Nor was the Father excluded from being with him in the body, but the Father was in him and he in the Father: whereupon he said to Philip, ‘He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.’ What! did every one that saw that body see the Father also? Nay not so, but he that saw Christ the Son of the living God, whom flesh and blood revealed not, but the Father only, Matt. xvi. 16, 17, he saw the Father also.”]—Page 61.

The compilers seem to evince but little perception in some of the passages which they have selected, and this among the number. It contains a most full and positive declaration, of the doctrines of “the three that bear record in heaven;” the ordained appearance of Jesus Christ in the flesh, and his eternal divinity and manhood. Scarcely could a pas-

sage be selected more directly at variance with the dogmas of Elias Hicks. It contradicts his assertions, that Jesus Christ was not the Son of God, until after the baptism of John; that he was liable to fall like other men; that he was no more than a man; that the same power that made Christ a Christian, must make us Christians; and that it was impossible the Word could take, or be made flesh; all which, Elias Hicks has repeatedly asserted.—See “Letters and Observations, &c. with the review of his Letter to Dr. N. Shoemaker.”

To those who will read the essay of I. Pennington, carefully and candidly, it must be apparent that he has in view, to recommend to all professors, an inward and living acquaintance with Jesus Christ, by the revelation of his own holy spirit; to draw them off from a dependence for salvation, upon a *mere literal* knowledge of the appearance of the Son of God in the flesh, without coming to witness his power and life revealed in the soul; and mainly to clear himself and his brethren, the Quakers, from that very imputation which the compilers insinuate against them, by adducing him as authority for Elias Hicks’ doctrines, viz. *denying the scriptures*, and the divinity and atonement of that Christ, who died at Jerusalem.

The compilers have italicised those parts of their extract where I. Pennington speaks of the distinction between the Christ of God, and the body of flesh; but they might have saved themselves the trouble, since Friends have always professed a belief, both in the manhood and in the Godhead of Christ, and this is the real meaning of I. Pennington; which is very different from the notion, that he was a mere fallible man, endued with a portion of the spirit, commensurate with the work he was called to, and that he was no otherwise divine, than as this spirit dwelt in him, or as every other Christian is. I. Pennington thought not so meanly of his Saviour, as is evident from the exalted epithets which he bestows upon him, in this very essay.

Francis Bugg, and after him, the author of the Snake in the Grass, quoted the parts of this extract which the compilers have italicised, in order to prove that the Quakers denied the proper humanity of the Lord Jesus. Joseph Wyeth and George Whitehead both replied to this aspersion. The following observations of G. Whitehead, may serve to show, that the meaning which the compilers would have us draw, from I. Pennington’s language, is not what was intended by the author. After reciting the Snake’s charge, he says—

“We know best our own meaning, being well satisfied that it is according to Holy Scripture. Where is then the difference? He then quarrels with our meaning, not with the words here, but elsewhere; he doth as his author, F. Bugg, has done with the words, “veil and garment,” in I. Pennington’s question to professors; but this author yields the point; he assents to both: as our soul is clothed with our body, as with a garment or veil, and so of Christ; which warrants I. Pennington’s question, against his author, F. Bugg, and himself, at least so far as not to make a subject of any further contention against us.”—See page 499.

Again on page 505: “Now, though our adversary has made a deal of dispute and quarrel with us about calling Christ’s flesh the veil,

as in Hebrews x., yet he is fain to grant that Christ's body is called a veil, in relation to its type, the veil of the temple, but he'll have this not to be in the Quaker's sense. They call it a veil; that is, saith he, a garment, in contradistinction to its being Christ's substance, and of his nature. Whereas it's rather in contradistinction to its being his divine nature; or to its being, in the first place, or principally, or chiefly, Christ himself, (who is the Son of God,) for whom the body was prepared; because he did pre-exist it, or was in being before he took upon him that body, even in his Father's glory, before the world began, wherewith he is glorified. However, the veil which was Christ's flesh, through which he set open the new and living way, *we never deny to be Christ's body*, or to be a *real body*, but own it was; and never believed it to be a fantastical body, as I have often said; but that Christ, the Son of God, took upon him real flesh and blood of our nature, *yet pure and uncorrupted*, IN HIM. And as his flesh was called the veil, it answers its type or figure, viz. the veil of the most holy place, or oracle, where God gave answers. 1 Kings vi. 20. viii. 6, 8. 2 Chron. iii. 10, 16. And these most holy places in the tabernacle and temple, being places of divine service, then peculiar to the high priest to enter into, their antitype is in Christ Jesus, the new covenant, where in spirit and in the truth, God is truly worshiped, and meets with and speaks to his people, even by Christ Jesus, their High Priest, who is present, in the midst of his church, and assemblies of his people, the true and spiritual worshipers, who meet in his name, spirit and power, whose light and truth brings its followers unto his holy tabernacles.—Psalm xliii. 3.

“And as to Christ's substance and nature, what does our opposer mean thereby? How has he distinguished in this point? *Christ has in him, a divine nature, as well as that of man*, which he hath also in *the purest sense*. But which is the greatest? Is not the divine nature, the Deity in him, greater than the manhood? As he said, ‘My Father is greater than all, greater than I.’ John x. 29. Nevertheless, as our great and only Mediator and Intercessor, *it was necessary* he should be man, as he is the most glorious heavenly Man; and as the Christ of God, he is spiritually in us, in the saints and members, in *some measure*, by his spirit, light, life, and power, even as the incorruptible, immortal seed in man, is of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and therein all true spiritual believers do, *in measure*, partake of the divine nature, being born again of this incorruptible seed.”—See also Switch, 202.

These very clear remarks of George Whitehead, must satisfy every candid reader, that by the use of the words *garment and veil*, the early Quakers never designed any thing more, than to distinguish between the essential divinity and manhood, of the Lord Jesus Christ. The manhood they could not consider as exclusively the Christ, nor yet the divinity exclusively, but gave the term Jesus Christ to both, declaring that what God had joined together, they could not separate, though they believed that the fulness of the Godhead, which dwelt in the manhood, was chiefly and eminently the Saviour.

The next quotation which we have from Pennington, is on pages 23 and 29, of the compilers' pamphlet. It is from a treatise entitled

Life and Immortality brought to light by the Gospel. Being a true discovery of the nature and ground of the Religion and Kingdom of Christ, &c." It is divided into sections and chapters; and the extract is taken from the eleventh chapter, entitled "Of the threefold appearances of Christ, to wit: under the law, in a body of flesh, and in his spirit and power." And from the second section, "concerning Christ's appearance in a body of flesh."

A very important part of this section is omitted, although it immediately precedes and follows the extract, and, commences and concludes the section. We would call the attention of the reader *particularly*, to the parts *left out*, as from the explicit testimony which they contain to the eternity, Godhead, and manhood of Jesus Christ; his humbling himself unto death for our sakes, and offering his life a sacrifice for sin; his ascension to the bosom of the Father; and glorification at the right hand of the throne of God in the heavens; it is but too clearly apparent, why they did not think proper to quote the whole fairly. They could not but know that if I. Pennington was permitted to speak for himself, he would directly contradict the sentiments avowed by Elias Hicks, and thus defeat the very object which they had in view, when making their extracts.

Isaac Pennington, after speaking of the shadowy dispensation of the law, says, "Secondly; *Concerning Christ's appearance in a body of flesh.* When the time of these shadows drew towards an end, and the fulness of time was come, he who thus appeared in several types and shadows, among that people of the Jews, under the law, *he now came down from the Father*, debased himself, and clothed himself like a man, partaking of flesh and blood; and was in all things, made like unto us (excepting Sin, for he was the Lamb without spot) humbling himself to come under the law, and under the curse, that he might redeem those that are under the law, (and under the curse) by fulfilling the righteousness thereof, and bringing them through into the righteousness everlasting,

☛ "Now while he was in the body, his glory did shine to the eye of the children of the true wisdom: his disciples (to whom not flesh and blood, nor the wisdom and knowledge which they could get from the letter, but his Father revealed him) they saw the hidden glory; they saw through the veil of his flesh, and beheld him as the only begotten of his Father, full of grace and truth. Now in this body he finished the work, which his Father gave him to do; he fulfilled all righteousness, (the righteousness of the letter, the righteousness of the Spirit) that he might bring his, through the righteousness of the law or letter, into the righteousness of the Spirit and power, into the righteousness of the new life; and here that Scripture is read and fulfilled, "I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live to God." So his whole life was a doing the will of the Father which sent him.

"When he was *but twelve years old*, he disputed with the doctors and teachers of the law, hearing and asking them questions (*discovering the pure wisdom of the Father which dwelt in him*) because it was his Father's business which he was to be about, as he told his mother. Luke ii. 49. And when the Lord led him into

“ the wilderness to be tried, he went and was tempted, that he might fight the battle against his great adversary. And when the Spirit of the Lord was upon him, moving him to preach the gospel, he preached the gospel, in the spirit and power of the Father, and went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil, as his Father’s Spirit led and guided him: for he did nothing of himself, or in his own will or for himself, but all in the will and time of the Father. ‘ Mine hour is not yet come,’ said he to his mother, when she was hasty to have him do that miracle of turning water into wine. John ii. 4. And so when his brethren urged him to go up to the feast. John vii. 5, 4. ‘ My time,’ said he ‘ is not yet come, your time is always ready,’ verse v.]

“ Thus he did always please his Father, and seek the honour of him that sent him; and was obedient to death, even the death of the cross, being willing to drink of the cup, which *his Father gave him to drink*; and so having finished his work, he returned from whence he came, and *sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high, being exalted above all principalities, and powers, and dominions, both in this world and in that which is to come.*”—See Vol. iv. pages 98, 99, 100.

Isaac Pennington here closes his remarks upon “ Christ’s appearance in the body of flesh,” and immediately proceeds to treat of his third or Spiritual appearance in the Soul. The parts extracted by the compilers are enclosed in brackets; and it will be observed that they are preceded and followed by a paragraph, each containing very important evidences of the soundness of his faith. Is it not doing great injustice to Isaac Pennington, thus to cull out a part of his remarks upon a subject, omitting that which precedes and follows, and is necessarily connected with it, and without which he cannot be fully understood; and in this mutilated state to publish them as a complete exposition of the author’s sentiments? Is such a course kind, or ingenuous? Does it not betray a consciousness of the weakness of the cause in which the compilers are engaged?

The purport of the omitted portions is worthy of particular notice. If Elias Hicks, and his friends, the compilers, believe in the divinity, manhood, or glorious offices of the Son of God, why do they, thus omit the paragraphs, which bear testimony to any of these? Why are they so fearful of quoting passages, where these are clearly and unequivocally acknowledged? Mutilated, however, as the quotation is, it does not accord with the notions of Elias Hicks. Isaac Pennington, in the compilers’ extract, calls our blessed Lord “ the only begotten of his Father, full of grace and truth.” Elias Hicks says that the Scripture evidence, proves he was the son of Joseph; and that he was no otherwise the Son of God than every good man is. Isaac Pennington says, that at twelve years of age, the pure wisdom of the Father dwelt in him. Elias Hicks asserts that the Holy Spirit was not conferred upon him until the baptism of John, when he was thirty years of age—that then and not till then, he became the Son of God, and that “ we hear of no miracles till after all this was done, none at all, nor any thing of his right-

eousness or acts." Query—Was it no miracle for a child of twelve years of age to confute the reasoning of the learned Scribes and Pharisees, and doctors of the law? Was it no righteousness, to be earnestly engaged in doing the will of his heavenly Father? "Wist ye not, said he, that I must be about my Father's business?" Was this no miracle in a child so young? Was it no righteousness, no act?

I. Pennington says, the Lord led him into the wilderness to be tempted. Elias Hicks declares that it was not an outward wilderness he was led into, but the wilderness state of his own mind. I. Pennington acknowledges the existence of an evil spirit or devil. Elias Hicks denies that there is any such being as a devil. See his sermons lately printed, especially those at Byberry and Falsington.

The next extract from I. Pennington, is on page 29 of the pamphlet; it is taken from a tract entitled "A Question to the Professors of Christianity, whether they have the true, living, powerful, saving knowledge of Christ, or no?" In this, as in several other of his essays, he enforces the necessity, of coming to know Christ revealed in the heart, by his spirit, asserting that *without this*, the mere historical knowledge of him, drawn from reading Holy Scripture, though true in itself, will never save the soul. The preface to it begins thus:

"This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." *Whom did the Father send? Did he not send the Son of his Love? From whence did he send him? Did he not send him out of his own bosom? Whither did he send him? Did he not send him into the world, to take upon him a body, and glorify the name of the Father, doing his will therein? He laid down his glory, stripping himself of the form of God, and appearing in habit as a man, in their raiment, with their garment upon him, in which, as a servant, the Seed, (the Heir of all,) served the Father; and now his work being as good as done, he looks back at the glory which he had laid down for the Father's sake, looking up to the Father, for the restoring of it to him again. "I have glorified thee on the earth, saith he, I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do, and now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was, John xvii. 4, 5."*—Vol. iii. page 25.

This short extract alone, is sufficient to decide the question whether I. Pennington believed in the sentiments asserted by Elias Hicks. Every unprejudiced person, who reads it, must be convinced that he does not; for the author makes a most explicit declaration of his belief in the eternity and divinity of our blessed Lord; in his being sent into the world by the Father, laying aside his glory—clothing himself with a body like our's, doing the will of the Father in all things, and finally laying down the humanity and returning again to the bosom of the Father, and entering into the glory which he had with Him before the world began. From an essay prefaced with so sound and scriptural a confession of faith in Christ, it was not to be supposed that the compilers could fairly extract any thing, that would favour the notions of Elias Hicks, and accordingly we

find, that they have had recourse to the most unjust mutilation and perversion of the author's language and meaning. We shall notice the extracts separately, and quote at length, in order fully to show their alterations and omissions—the parts which they quote are enclosed in brackets.

The pious author begins his essay with stating the question which he is going to discuss, viz: "The question is not, whether they know what is said of Christ in the scriptures, but whether they know it savingly, truly, livingly, powerfully?"—And then proceeds to enforce this latter kind of knowledge—on page 29, he says:

"Our knowledge is in a principle, wherein we receive our capacity of knowing, and wherein the Father, (from whom the principle came,) teacheth us. And this is his way of teaching us, by making us one with the thing he teacheth. Thus we learn Christ, by being born of him, by putting him on. Thus we know his righteousness, his life, his wisdom, his power, by receiving a *proportion* of them, which giveth an ability to discern and *acknowledge the fulness*. And in this, we receive the understanding of the scriptures, and know the seed of the woman, (which bruise the serpent's head,) by receiving the seed, by feeling its growth in us, and its power over the enemy. Then we know the thing; likewise we know the woman, that brings forth this seed after the Spirit, *which is the Jerusalem above*; and *we know also*, and singly *acknowledge* the bringing forth of it *outwardly, after the flesh*. This seed we know to be the seed of Abraham, the seed of David after the flesh, and the seed of God after the power of the endless life; and *we are taught of God to give the due honour to each*; to the seed of God in the first place, to the seed of David in the second place. There was the seed that wrought the thing, which seed was the life, and [the seed,] in which he wrought it, which [“was formed into a vessel like ours, but without sin, in which the pure Lamb appeared in the pure power of life, which kept the vessel pure, and so he, (who was to be the first fruits,) had the honour above all his brethren, being anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows.

“But we also are born of the same seed. He is formed in us; we are formed of him; we are as well of his flesh and blood, as he was of ours. And by being thus formed, and feeling him grow up in us, and receiving an understanding *from him, and in him*, thus we come to know him, and to understand the words of scripture concerning him. By feeling and knowing the Lamb in our vessels, we know also what was the Lamb in his vessel.”

“Thus we know things in the certainty and demonstration of God's Spirit, even in the light which shines from him, and in the life which he begets; and we speak of things as they are, and as we feel them to be in the true life, which the Spirit of Christ hath begotten in us. And we can truly say concerning the scriptures, That now we believe, not so much because of the relation of things concerning Christ, which we have found in them; but because we have seen and received the thing, which the scriptures speak of, and find it to be the very thing indeed, the very Christ of God, the spotless one, the living garment of righteousness and salvation, wherein God findeth



no fault, and in which the soul appears without blame before him."—
Vol. iii. page 30.

From this extended quotation of Isaac Pennington's language, the reader will at once perceive, how far he is from holding the doctrines of Elias Hicks, and also the great injustice which the compilers have done him by altering and garbling his sentences in order to force upon them *their own*, not *his* meaning. They commence quoting after a semicolon, omitting the copulative conjunction "*and*," which connects the sense with what precedes; take in two words, "*the seed*," then *omit six words*, which are necessary to define I. Pennington's meaning. What confidence can be placed in the quotations of men who can thus deliberately change the language of an author, to make him speak sentiments, suited to their own purposes, without regarding, yea, even changing his own assertions? Where was the integrity and honesty of the compilers, when engaged in this work?

It is curious to see the pains they have taken to avoid inserting the preceding part of the paragraph, in which the author expresses his belief in both the divinity and manhood of the Lord Jesus. He defines two seeds; one the everlasting Seed of the kingdom, the eternal Word, by whom the worlds were made; the other, the seed of Abraham and David after the flesh, the manhood, in which the Holy Seed or Godhead dwelt in fulness. Both these, he says, the Quakers were taught, singly to own and acknowledge; to confess Christ, both as he appeared in the flesh, and as he is come in the spirit, giving *due honour to each seed*, to the seed of the kingdom in the first place, to the seed of Abraham and David in the second place. The true Quakers, he declares, were taught to know Christ by being born of him, by putting him on; and by obeying that proportion of divine light received from Him, they were taught to discern and acknowledge the fulness which is in Christ Jesus. He confesses their belief in all that is declared in the scriptures concerning his outward manifestation in the flesh, and that these very scriptures were livingly opened and confirmed to their minds, by the operation of that Holy Spirit which gave the scriptures forth. Now if the light of Christ Jesus thus taught the early Quakers to own Christ both outwardly and inwardly, and to believe in all that is written concerning him in the sacred volume, it is evident that their pretended successors, who are denying these solemn truths, cannot be guided by that unerring spirit which never can contradict itself. They have swerved from the ancient faith of the gospel, and departed from that religious profession for which our worthy predecessors suffered so deeply.—Let the reader compare the sentiments of Elias Hicks, with those acknowledged by I. Pennington. the contrast will be strikingly obvious!

On pages 29 and 30 of the pamphlet, we have another extract from the same essay of I. Pennington, in making which, the compilers have again omitted a considerable part of the paragraph, which is immediately connected with what they quote, and necessary to give the true sense of the whole. The paragraph is as follows:—the

part quoted by the compilers is enclosed in brackets, designated by a hand.

“And this may be a great evidence to professors, that they know not indeed Christ in his nature, spirit, life, and power; because they speak not of him, as persons who feel the thing, and speak from the present sense of it, and acquaintance with it, but only as persons that bring forth a notion, they have received into their understandings. And yet they fail therein also, for they speak not of Christ according as the scriptures hold him forth, compared one with another, but as they have grossly apprehended concerning him, from some scriptures as the Jews outward did. For the scriptures speak not only of a body, but also of Him that appeared in the body; nor only of bodily flesh, blood and bones, but also of such flesh and bones whereof Christ and his church consist. He is Christ (say the scriptures) who is one with the Father, who came from the Father, in whom the Father was, and who was in the Father; so said Jesus of himself, (lifting up his eyes to heaven and praying to the Father of his disciples, and the children whom the Father had given him,) more than once in that seventeenth chapter of John. Yea, he is Christ whom a man cannot see, but he must see the Father also; and whom, whosoever seeth the Father, seeth; who was before Abraham was; whom no man could know whence he was, even as no man can know whence the Father is.— [Christ granted the Jews that they knew him, and whence he “was, as to his body; and yet for all that, he was the Christ who “was to come, whom no man knew, from whence he was. What was “that, Christ called ME, speaking to Philip? ‘Hast thou not known “ME, Philip, hast thou not seen ME? What, dost thou know ME “after the flesh, after the body? Dost thou take that for ME? Have “I been so long with you, and do you know ME no better than so? “The body is from below, the body is like one of yours, (only sanctified by the Father, and preserved without sin;) but I am the same “spirit, life, and being with the Father. We are one substance, “one pure power of life, and we cannot be divided; but he that “sees one, must needs see both; and he that knows one must needs “know both. This is the Lamb of God which John bare witness of, “which he said was before him, John i. 15, which the body was “not.”]—Pages 31, 32.

The partial extract made by the compilers does not by any means coincide with the notions of Elias Hicks, which it is adduced to support. I. Pennington sufficiently expresses a belief in the Godhead and Manhood of Jesus Christ; his oneness in nature, spirit, life, and being with the Father; his existence before his appearance in the flesh, and his being the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. And while he distinguishes between the Godhead and Manhood of Christ, and says, “the body is like one of yours;” lest it should thence be inferred, that he made it no holier than any other human body, he reverently adds, “only sanctified by the Father and preserved without sin;” which shows how far he was from equalizing Christ with man, even as related to his humanity only.

Another quotation from the same essay, occurs on page 30 of the pamphlet, and presents us with a still more open and direct pervers-


sion of the doctrines of I. Pennington, than we have yet had occasion to notice.

It appears there were some illiberal persons, cotemporary with Isaac Pennington, who like our compilers, accused the Quakers, of denying the scripture testimony, to *that Christ who died at Jerusalem*, &c.; and in order to clear himself and his brethren from so foul an aspersion, he gives forth a declaration of his belief, respecting the Lord Jesus Christ. This declaration consists of three articles, all of which are necessary, fully to give his faith on the subject; and we could scarcely have supposed that the compilers would have stooped to so great an outrage upon the Christian character of this good man, as to mutilate and garble a declaration of his faith, to prove his denial of Christ; when that very declaration was put forth by the author, to prove that he did not so deny. True it is, that they fail in their object, even with all their unfairness, but this is to his credit, not theirs. The turpitude of their design is none the less apparent. The following quotation will prove the truth of what we say—the compilers' extract is enclosed in brackets:

“Now, a little further to remove the scruples and prejudices, out of the minds of such, as sometimes have been touched with the power of truth, and have had the witness of God reached to, in their hearts; but afterwards the enemy hath raised mists and cast blocks in their way, stirring up in them, hard thoughts against us, as if we denied what the scriptures affirm in this thing, and indeed, (in effect,) that Christ which died at Jerusalem, and set up a natural principle within, instead thereof. To remove this out of the minds of the honest-hearted, (who, in the guidance of God, might light on this paper,) I shall *open my heart nakedly herein*.”

First—We do own that the Word of God, (the only begotten of the Father,) did take up a body of the flesh of the Virgin Mary, who was of the seed of David, according to the scriptures, and did the will of the Father therein, in holy obediençé unto him, both in life and death.

Secondly—That he *did offer up the flesh and blood of that body*, (though not only so; for he poured out his soul, he poured out his life,) a sacrifice or offering for sin, (do not, Oh! do not stumble at it; but rather wait on the Lord to understand it; *for we speak in this matter what we know*;) a sacrifice unto the Father, and in it, *tasted death for every man*; and that it is *upon consideration*, (and *through God's acceptance of this sacrifice for sin*;) that the sins of believers are pardoned, that God might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus, or who is of the faith of Jesus.

Thirdly—“ What is attributed to that body, we acknowledge, and give to that body, in its place, according as the scripture attributeth it, which is through, and because of that which dwelt and acted in it. But that which sanctified and kept the body pure, (and made all acceptable in him,) was the life, holiness, and righteousness of the Spirit; and the same thing that kept his vessel pure, it is the same thing that *cleanseth us*. The value which the natural flesh and blood had, was from that; in *its coming from that*; in its acting in that; in its suffering through that: yea, indeed,

“that hath the virtue;”] that is it which is of an *unchangeable nature*, which abideth forever; which is pure, and maketh pure forever, and it is impossible for a man to touch it, but he must feel cleansing by it. Now this living virtue and power, man was *shut out from by the fall*; but through the true knowledge of *the death of Christ*, the way is made open for it again, and man brought to it to be baptised, washed, cleansed, sanctified, fitted for, and filled with, life. So that this it is, that doth the thing; this is it from whence Christ had his own flesh and blood, (for we are taught both by the Spirit and by the scriptures, to distinguish between Christ’s own flesh, and that of ours, which he took up and made his;) which flesh and blood we feed of in the Spirit; which they cannot feed on, which serve at the outward tabernacle, nor they neither which know only the outward body; but they only that feed in the Spirit.”—Vol. iii. pages 33, 34.

By noticing where the brackets are placed, the reader will perceive that the compilers omit the two first articles of the confession, and close their extract at a semicolon, taking in only six words of a sentence, which begins after a colon, and in which I. Pennington is declaring the immutability, eternity, and purity of the Holy Spirit of Christ—then follows his assertion of the fall of man, and the restoring virtue of the sacrifice of Christ, all which, is purposely omitted by the compilers. The two first articles of this confession of faith are particularly full and clear—they assert the belief of the early Quakers in the scripture testimony, that the Word of God, took up a body of flesh of the Virgin Mary, and did the will of the Father therein; that he offered up the *flesh and blood of that very body*, a sacrifice for sin, and in it tasted death for every man; that it is upon consideration, and through God’s acceptance of this sacrifice, that the sins of believers are pardoned. This is the doctrine of the early Quakers, and lest any who were striving to comprehend it in their own reason, should be tempted to deny it, the author exhorts them, to *wait on the Lord to understand it*, for they spake what *they knew* herein. How evident it is, that the dogmas of Elias Hicks, are not only *innovations* upon the ancient faith of the Society of Friends; but direct contradictions, and bitter anathemas, against some of its most sacred and solemn truths.

Even the mutilated quotation of the compilers, does not accord with the unbelief of Elias Hicks, since I. Pennington declares *in it*, the belief of Friends, in all that is attributed to that holy body of Christ, in the scriptures of truth, and to its being miraculously conceived; likewise to the value of the sacrifice of the natural flesh and blood. Now, every one who has read the letters and sermons of Elias Hicks, must see that he denies much that is attributed to the body of Christ in the sacred volume, especially its miraculous conception, and the efficacy of the propitiatory sacrifice, declaring that it is not an atonement for any sins, but the legal sins of the Jews.

The next quotation, given by the compilers, is from Isaac Pennington’s “Epistle to all such as observe the seventh day of the week, for the Sabbath of the Lord.” The object of the author, in

this essay, is to show that the dispensation of the law of Moses is abolished by the coming and death of Christ, and that the new and more glorious dispensation of the gospel is now come. He points out some of the rituals of the law, as being typical of the more excellent, spiritual things of the gospel, and concludes with enforcing the necessity of witnessing the law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus, to set free from the law of sin and death; that thus the soul may realize the living substance of those things, which the types of the law shadowed forth.


The extract inserted by the compilers makes nothing for their cause, and yet such is their aptness at disjoining sentences, that they have commenced after a comma, left out the leading part of the author's sentence, without which his meaning cannot be understood, and placed it in their pamphlet as though it were complete in itself, and fairly extracted. This will be seen by reference to the following, where the part they have inserted is enclosed in brackets.

“Now the sum or substance of this law of the spirit, may outwardly be signified, in divers short words; as love, that comprehends the whole of it; so doth fear; there is the whole wisdom and course of the life, comprehended also; or thus, ‘Thou shalt not lust;’ (thus is was administered to Paul; Romans vii.) or ‘thou shalt keep the Sabbath;’ or ‘believe in the light, follow the light.’ The observing of any one of these, in the spirit, is the keeping of the law; for every breach of the law is out of the love; out of the fear; the lust of the fleshly spirit; a transgression of the Sabbath, or spiritual rest to God, out of the light, and out of the faith. But if ye will read this in the spirit, and come to the true righteousness of the faith, which is received in the obedience of faith to the law of the spirit, [ye “ must come to the word of faith; to which Paul directs, Romans x. “ G, by the hearing whereof is the justification, and not by a bare “ believing that Christ's blood was shed; for it is *the virtue of the “ blood* which saves, which virtue is in the living Word, and is felt “ and received in hearing, believing, and obeying that Word, thereby “ bringing into unity and conformity with him, both in his death, and “ in his resurrection and life. This is the only way to life; be not “ deceived; there is not, nor ever was, any other.] Oh wait on the Lord in his fear! that it may be opened to you, and that slain in you which cannot bear the straitness thereof. and with which there is no erring.”—Pennington, Vol. ii. pages 58, 59.

Such are the liberties which these compilers take with the composition of their authors; and what may they not thus make them express? It is well to observe, that in their own extract I. Pennington declares, that it is *the virtue* of the blood of Christ that saves the soul; though he also very properly remarks that the blessed benefit of it, can only be known and felt, by yielding obedience to the Holy Spirit of Christ Jesus, inwardly revealed. Now Elias Hicks not only denies that there is any redeeming virtue to the soul, in the precious blood of Christ, but anathematizes the doctrine of the propitiatory sacrifice, as wicked and absurd.—See the Review of his Letter to Dr. N. Shoemaker, and his Sermons, recently printed

We have next, on pages 30, 31, a quotation from an essay by the same author, entitled, "Some questions and answers for the direction, comfort, help, and furtherance of God's spiritual Israel," &c. in which he declares the state of man in the fall, his blindness, ignorance, and darkness, while in it, and the impossibility of his bringing himself out of it. He then queries—

"What is the work of redemption? Answer.—To purge the old leaven out of the vessel, to purify the vessel from all the false appearances of light, to batter down all the strong holds of the enemy in the mind, all the reasonings, thoughts, imaginations, and consultations, which are not of the pure, or in the pure; and so to new create and new form the vessel, in the image of the wisdom and purity wherein it was at first formed.

Question.—Who doth this work, or  [who is man's Redeemer out of the fall?

"A.—The Eternal Word, or Son of the Father, even the wisdom and power which went forth from the Fountain in the creation, the same goeth forth from the bosom of the Father, to purify the creature, and so bringeth the creature back, being purified and cleansed, into his bosom again.


"Q.—With what doth this Word, or Redeemer, redeem?

"A.—With his own life, with his own blood, with his own eternal virtue and purity. He descendeth into the lower parts of the earth, becomes flesh there, sows his own seed in his prepared earth, begets of his flesh and of his bone, in his own likeness, and nourisheth up his birth, with his flesh and blood unto life everlasting.

"Q.—What is this life? or how doth it first manifest itself in the darkness?

"A.—It is the light of men. It is that which gave light to Adam at first, again to him after the fall, and to all men since the fall. It enlightens in nature; it enlightened under the law; it did enlighten under the gospel before the apostacy, and again, since the apostacy.

"Q.—How doth the light enlighten?

"A.—By its shining. The eternal word moves, the life opens, the light shines: this, in the least degree is a beginning of redemption; in its fulness it is redemption perfected."  Vol. ii. p. 281.

The object of I. Pennington in these queries, is to describe the inward work of redemption out of the fall; out of the thralldom of sin inherent, by the power and spirit of Jesus Christ our Lord. This is evident, from the first query and answer which we have extracted, and lest the readers of their pamphlet should perceive the true intent and meaning of Isaac Pennington, the compilers omit the first query, which describes what he is about to treat of in the others, and also cut off a part of the second question, viz. "Who doth *this work*," doubtless with the same view. These little indications of unfairness and want of integrity, would of themselves, be quite sufficient to destroy the credit of their pamphlet, in the estimation of every generous and candid mind. I. Pennington reiterates the declaration again and again, in his works, that a belief in the necessity of the inward work, did not in any degree invalidate

the faith of Friends, in the outward sacrifice, but taught them, reverently to esteem and own it, and to feel grateful therefor, to him who has ordained it.

Upon the same page of the pamphlet, we have a quotation from I. Pennington's "Salutation of love and tender good will to the commissioners of the peace, in the county of Bucks;" in which he solemnly warns them of the necessity of a *real change of heart*, and of the insufficiency of all things else, to save the soul. The compilers close their quotation at a semicolon; but the sentiments contained in it are so truly excellent, and so opposite to those of Elias Hicks, that we are pleased with the opportunity of presenting the whole paragraph to our readers, viz.

☞—"There is no way of avoiding the eternal, insupportable wrath of God, but by travelling out of that nature, spirit and course, which it is to. Him that sowed to sin and corruption under the Law, the sacrifices would not save then; nor him that soweth to sin and corruption under the Gospel, the sacrifice of Christ will not save now; but he that is saved by Christ, must be sanctified and redeemed from sin and corruption by him; which Christ worketh by his principle of life sown in the heart;"—☞ which principle turneth against the contrary principle discovering its nature, and evil dark ways, and drawing from, and leading out of them. Oh! therefore let me in love entreat you, all my dear countrymen, (indeed I have no end in it but your good) to mind that in your hearts, which discovers your evils to you, that therein ye may feel the power of life drawing you from them, and helping you against them. Greater is the power in this, than the power that is in the contrary principle; as those that hearken to it, and become subject, by experience feel. And what if ye lose a few fond pleasures for the present, (which indeed are beneath the true state of a man) ye will lose a great deal of misery too, and your gain at last will be exceeding great."—Vol. ii 389.

From this language of Isaac Pennington, it is most evident, that while he asserts, that he who soweth to sin and corruption, shall not be benefited by the sacrifice of Christ; he does clearly imply, that he who soweth to the Spirit, shall as surely partake of the benefits of that holy offering for sin. This is the true doctrine of Quakerism.—How different it is from that of Elias Hicks, the reader must at once perceive.

Page 32 of the compilers' pamphlet, presents us with three lines, extracted from an essay of Isaac Pennington's, entitled "The Holy Truth and People Defended," in which he is replying to a number of charges made against Friends by one, who like our compilers, would make it appear, that they denied redemption and justification by Christ, &c. To the first he replies—

"And as for denying *redemption by the blood of Christ*, oh! how will he answer this charge to God, when none upon the earth, (as the Lord God knoweth) are so taught, and do so rightly and fully own Redemption by the blood of Christ, as the Lord hath taught us to do! for *we own the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, both outwardly and inwardly; both as it was shed on the cross, and as it is*

sprinkled in our consciences ; and know the cleansing virtue thereof in the everlasting covenant, and in the light which is eternal ; out of which light, men have but a notion thereof, but do not truly know nor own it. And let him consider, before the time of Antichrist, it was a great matter to know and own Christ outwardly, as he appeared in that body ; but since the Antichristian Spirit hath got that, the distinguishing knowledge and owning of Christ is, to know, and own him inwardly. The outward knowledge and confession now, (as it is generally separated from, and held forth in way of distinction from the inward,) is but the knowledge and confession of Babylon, and not the true, living knowledge and confession of Christ, in and by the Spirit of the Father, which is the knowledge and confession of all the children of the true and heavenly mother, which is the mother of all that are born of the Spirit.”—Vol. iii. pages 234, 235.

At the time when Isaac Pennington wrote this essay, too many professors were placing their whole dependence for salvation, upon a bare historical knowledge of the coming and death of the Son of God, vainly expecting justification from the guilt of sin, whilst they continued in the commission of it, and denying entirely the sensible influences of the Holy Spirit. This knowledge and confession of Christ, by those who rejected him and his government, Isaac Pennington calls the knowledge and confession of Babylon, that the antichristian spirit had got ; and he exhorts them to come to that inward and living acquaintance with him, which would enable them from their own experience, to set their seals to the truth of all that is declared of him in Holy Scripture.

It is sorrowful to observe, that in the very society of which he was so honourable a member, the day that he alludes to seems to have come, when it is “ a great matter to know and own Christ outwardly, as he appeared in that body.” The Antichristian Spirit which then led the unwatchful, to place undue confidence in the knowledge of Christ outwardly, in this day, is seducing many into a denial of this blessed manifestation in the flesh, under the specious and delusive pretence, of exalting his inward appearance ; though in truth, they are thereby denying and rejecting both. The extract we have given, is so pertinent a reply to the compilers, for their endeavours to prove that he rejected redemption by Christ, that it is well worthy of their serious perusal. The three lines given by them, are taken from Isaac Pennington’s reply to the following objection, viz :

“ He [an opponent] saith *he feareth lest I make this life and virtue our righteousness, which is indeed the fruits of it.*

“ Answer.—Who is this that darkeneth counsel, by words without knowledge, and runneth out from the truth into his own imaginations ? [“ What was Christ’s righteousness ? Was it not the “ life, the virtue, the Spirit of the Father in him, he being one with “ it, in the faith of it, and in the obedience to it ?”] And is not the righteousness of the Head, and the body the same, *communicated from the Head to the body ?* Are they not all of one, and the righteousness one and the same in both ? So much of Christ’s spirit,

so much of *his righteousness*; and out of his spirit, *out of his righteousness* for evermore. For the righteousness of the Son *is revealed, and communicated* from faith to faith, in his Spirit; and so *Christ* is indeed *made righteousness* to them that are found in his Spirit; and they are covered with the garment of righteousness and salvation, who are covered with his Spirit."—Vol. iii. p. 236.

On page 238, I. Pennington remarks—

"He [the opponent] saith, Were we godly before, or at that time, it were no act of grace to pronounce us righteous.

"Answer—He that witnesseth *Salvation in Christ Jesus*, witnesseth it to be a *continued act of grace*. Grace appears to the soul, grace teacheth, grace enableth, grace maketh a change from the ungraciousness of the heart and state, and then grace, (or God by his grace, *in and through Jesus Christ*) forgiveth the sins that were committed before. For though the Lord visit me with life, quicken me thereby, make a change in my heart, and state, yet it is his mercy to accept me, and to pass by for his name sake, my former debts and trespasses against him. Alas! the new covenant, is wholly a covenant of grace and mercy; and the *giving of Christ*, drawing the mind to him, *accepting and justifying in Him*, are works of grace and mercy towards his. So the Spiritual Israel, may well sing this song in the land of holiness and redemption; "O praise the Lord! for he is good, and his mercy endureth forever! I can truly set my seal to this thing; that the more holy and righteous, the Lord *maketh me in his Son*, the more sensible am I of his love, grace and mercy, in justifying of me; and *it is precious to me*, to witness *justification and acceptance with him, in and through his Son*."

Such is the holy and devout language of this experienced servant of God!—How directly the reverse of the sentiments of Elias Hicks in his letter to Drs. N. Shoemaker and E. A. Atlee.

The next quotation from Isaac Pennington, is on page 42 of the compilers' pamphlet. It is taken from a work entitled "Some of the Mysteries of God's Kingdom glanced at, &c."—the preface to it, begins with these remarkable words—"None but Christ, none but Christ, saith my soul, from the sense of my continual need of him, and from the deep love of my heart unto him. Now there is a twofold way of knowing Christ, *both which are of use*, and have their service, in their several seasons, according to the estate and condition of the soul, and according to the dispensation, which it pleaseth God to set up among his people; the one whereof is *literal*, the other *spiritual*; the one is according to a description of him, received into the understanding; the other is according to the revelation or unveiling of him in the heart."—Vol. ii. p. 405.

He then proceeds to exemplify these two ways of knowing Christ, and insists upon the great necessity of witnessing him, inwardly revealed in the heart. The work itself commences thus:

"What is Christ? Answer. He is the immediate offspring of Eternal life in himself, and the fountain or spring of life unto the creation. 'Even as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to

the Son to have life in himself; and in and through his Son, he communicateth of his life, unto his creatures."—page 407.

Of repentance, he has the following excellent observations:—
 "What is repentance? Answer. It is Christ's turning of the heart from the dead nature, and from the dead works, towards the living principle, and the living works thereof.

"Question 2.—Cannot a man turn from sin, and turn to God *when he will*?

"Answer. *No.*—Man is a captive; his understanding captive; his will captive; all his affections and nature in captivity; and nothing can turn him towards God, but that which is stronger than that power which captivateth him.

"Question 3.—How is repentance wrought?

"Answer.—It is Christ's gift, whom God hath appointed a Prince and Saviour, to give repentance and remission of sins, who giveth it in his enlightening and drawing virtue, wherein sin's nature is opened and the bent of the soul, by him, secretly turned against it."—page 410.

Under the head of obedience, after declaring that it "is the obedience of the seed conveyed into the creature by the seed" that forms the obedience of the true child of God; he adds these truly sublime and evangelical remarks.

"Mark how every thing in the kingdom, every spiritual thing, refers to Christ and centres in him. *His nature, his virtue, his presence, his power, makes up all.* Indeed, *HE is all in all to a believer,* only variously manifested and opened in the heart, by the Spirit. He is the *volume of the whole book,* every leaf and line whereof speaks of him, and writes out him in some or other of his sweet and beautiful lineaments."—page 417.

In the same essay, treating of justification, he thus beautifully sets forth his faith, in the virtue of the atoning blood of Jesus Christ.

"Question 5.—How is this justification wrought?

"Answer.—By *faith in the virtue which floweth from Christ.* God, letting in, of the nature of his Son into the heart, and begetting therein, somewhat of his own likeness, in which he draweth, and which he giveth to believe in: this faith is *imputed* by God for *righteousness*, in every heart, wherever it is found: and where this faith in the living virtue is found, there God blotteth out the iniquities for his name sake; yea and remission is felt in that which is made living. And *there is one near* who hath power to bind or loose, in the conscience, according to the nature of the dispensation; and who doth bind or loose in every dispensation as he findeth cause. *But all loosing of sins, is for Christ's sake, and through his blood;* though every one, in every dispensation, is not able distinctly so to read it. Yea, under the law, *the remission was by this sacrifice;* though many of the Jews could not read the type. The promise is to the seed of the kingdom, and to man in the seed; and there it reacheth him, whenever it findeth him: for in all his gatherings into, and being found in that, he is blest."—pages 422, 423.

We should not have supposed that an essay, so fraught with the

noliest doctrines of the scriptures of truth, would have been referred to by the compilers, to support a system of unbelief. But as it often happens in such a cause, the weapons used for its defence, turn against itself.

I. Pennington queries, What is redemption? This he defines to be "the purchasing of the vessel, out of the captivity and misery of death, into the liberty and blessedness of the divine life, sown, revealed, grown up, and perfected in the heart." This then is complete sanctification, which Friends have never believed to be effected by the outward offering only. They believe that this Holy sacrifice procured the remission of sins and opened a new and living way for the people of God to approach unto Him, but that complete sanctification is never to be obtained but by yielding obedience to the grace or good spirit of the Son of God, in the heart. That I. Pennington had no intention of denying the virtue of Christ's death, will appear, from what immediately follows the compilers' quotations, viz:

"When Sion, in any heart is built up, it is natural to the Lord to appear there in his glory, and the pure eye sees it, and the pure heart enjoys, and is one with it. So that as there is a true entrance into fellowship in, and *enjoyment of, the death of Christ*, so is there also of the resurrection and glory of the redeemed life; which is the portion and inheritance, which God hath prepared for Sion, after her long desolation and sore widowhood; which he will give unto her in the sight of all the world, whereby she shall become the beauty, joy, and praise of the whole earth; who hath hitherto been the reproached, despised, and afflicted, and made a prey of, by the several sorts of devouring spirits."—Vol. iii. pages 427, 428.

In the next quotation from I. Pennington, pages 47, 48, of the compilers' pamphlet, we have a full acknowledgment of the propitiatory sacrifice of Jesus Christ, of the good pleasure of the Father in his offering up himself on the cross, and of the great efficacy it had, in the redemption of fallen man. I. Pennington refers to those forcible expressions of the apostle Paul in Romans, v. 18, 19. "Therefore, as by the *offence of one*, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so *by the righteousness of one*, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For, as by one man's disobedience, many were made sinners; so *by the obedience of one*, shall many be made righteous." It is a little remarkable, that the compilers, in order to prove that I. Pennington rejected this doctrine, should adduce a quotation from an essay, which he wrote to set forth his full belief and firm faith in it. The essay from which the extract is made, is entitled "Life and Immortality brought to light by the Gospel, &c." and the eighteenth section, containing the quoted sentence, is thus headed: "Some observations concerning the Priesthood of Christ, from several passages in the Hebrews." We shall insert some parts of it. He thus commences:

"Observation 1.—Who is the Apostle, and High Priest of our profession? It is Jesus Christ the Son of God, whom God hath appoint-

ed Heir of all things, by whom he made the worlds, and who is the express image of his Father's substance, &c. Heb. i. and iii. 1.

"Observation 2. Why this High Priest was to suffer death? which was, that he might taste death for every man, and so through suffering, become a perfect Saviour, or perfect Captain of Salvation, to all the sons that were to be brought by him to glory, ii. 9, 10.

"Observation 3. Why he partook of flesh and blood? one reason whereof was, because the children (and that therein he might show them an example of righteousness, that he might condemn himself in the flesh) were partakers of flesh and blood; for that was the very ground or reason, that he took part of the same: another reason was, that which was mentioned before; *that he might taste death*, and through death destroy him, who had the power of death, and so break open the prison doors, and deliver those who were captives under him, ii. 14, 15.

"Observation 4. Why he was, tempted, and why in all things, it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren? Which was, "that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God; to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." For his own suffering under temptations, (even the sense thereof,) renders him merciful, tender, faithful, and ready to help, and succour his, in all their temptations, ii. 17, 18.

"Mark; Christ *was not only to die*, and so offer up a *sacrifice of atonement*, but he was also *to make reconciliation by it*, ever afterwards for his children, (in case of transgression,) whenever occasion should be. So saith John, "If any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father," (to plead for the forgiving and blotting out of the sin,) "and he is the propitiation, (or reconciliation) for our sins;" as the old translation renders it, 1 John ii. 1, 2.—Vol. iv. pages 121, 122.

"Observation 16. That this High Priest needeth not to offer many sacrifices to atone by, as the priests under the law needed to do often: for he was a perfect Priest, *and offered up one perfect, spotless sacrifice*; and 'is a propitiation for the sins of the whole world,' vii. 27, 28.

"Observation 23. For what cause, Christ was Mediator of the New Testament? which was, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressors under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance, verse 15. For God hath made Christ, *a propitiation for all men*, both Jews and Gentiles, that through faith in his blood, his righteousness might be declared, *for remission of sins that are past*, through the forbearance of God, that he might be just, and a justifier of him, who is of the faith of Jesus. Rom. iii. 15, 16. So that they that were under the first covenant, hearkening unto him, and believing in him, were justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses, Acts xiii. 39.

"Observation 24. The necessity of Christ's death; which was, because he was to make way by his own blood into the holiest, to appear before God for us, and to sprinkle the heavenly things with the blood of a Sacrifice, of an higher and better nature, than the blood of

bulls and goats was; for that was the blood of the covenant which was to pass away; but he was to sprinkle his, with the blood of the everlasting covenant; and by this his death and blood, (sprinkled upon the hearts of his,) his covenant comes to be of force, Hebrews x. 16 to 25, and xiii. 20, 21.

“Observation 25.—That this High Priest need not often offer sacrifices to put away sin, as the priests of the law did; because *this one offering is sufficient*; and the blood thereof sprinkled upon the conscience, is able to purge away dead works, wherever it is sprinkled. There needeth not *any other offering*, nor any other blood to do it; but all that is now further *needed*, or *to be expected by his*, is his appearing the second time, without sin, unto salvation, in the pure virtue, power, and life, of his own spirit.—Verse 25 to the end.

“Observation 26.—☞ [What it was, that was the thing of great value with the Father, in Christ giving up himself to death? It was his obedience. He did obey his Father in all things, not doing his own will, but the will of him that sent him. ‘He was obedient to death, even the death of the cross?’ and so, as by one man’s disobedience, death came upon all, so by the obedience of one, the free gift came upon all; which free gift is unto life; for life comes upon all that come to him, and believe in him, through the free gift, which is freely tendered to, and come upon all.—Rom. v. 18, 19.

“Observation 27.—That God took away sacrifices and burnt offerings, which were appointed by the old covenant; that he might establish this obedience among all his children. Christ led the way, and all are to follow him in the new obedience, and to walk in newness of spirit before the Lord.—Verse 9.

“Observation 28.—That we are sanctified by the same will by which Christ was sanctified, or *sanctifieth himself*. In subjection to the same will which the head obeyed, (even in denying themselves, taking up the cross to their own wills and submitting to God,) are the members sanctified. ☞ The spirit of God works them into holiness, by this will of God, and *through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once*.—Verse 10. John xvii. 19.

“So mark: there is the will of God, *the offering up the body of Jesus*, the pouring out the spirit of grace, the new covenant, and *faith in Christ*, &c. *All these tend to work out one and the same thing*, and they *all concur thereto* in their several orders and places.”—Vol. iv. page 128.

The reader will now perceive what part of the observations of I. Pennington the compilers have thought proper to extract, and it is worthy of particular notice, that they close their quotation within two lines of the end of a paragraph, omitting the remainder of it, and also the concluding paragraph of the observation. And why, we would ask, do they omit these? Because they assert the author’s belief in the propitiatory sacrifice of the body of the Lord Jesus Christ, and directly contradict the positive denial of that offering which Elias Hicks so often makes. It is indeed mournful to see men who profess a regard to honourable principles, thus mutilating the language of an author, to make him speak sentiments directly the re-

verse of what he holds. Isaac Pennington is one of those humble-believing Christians, who receive with reverent gratitude the glorious doctrine of pardon and redemption, through the blood of Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God; a doctrine whose professors Elias Hicks is pleased to call "idle and ignorant," "bold and daring," "destitute of any right sense of justice and honesty, mercy and love."

The next quotation made by the compilers, is from the preface to a treatise by I. Pennington, entitled "The consideration of a position concerning the book of common prayer." The compilers have, as usual with them, treated him unfairly, by taking their extract from a paragraph, the different sentences of which are connected so as to be necessary to the full understanding of the author's meaning. We shall insert the whole paragraph, enclosing the compilers' quotation in brackets.

"Christ, the *Eternal Son of God*, the *substance* of all the types and shadows of the law, was made a Priest to God, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life. He came in the power of the Father, he received the power, he ministered the power, and in the power. Thus he gathered together living stones, built them into a living temple for the Father of life to dwell in, that they may be filled with the power, dwell in the power, and be to the glory of the power. The church of Israel, the church of the old testament, the church of Moses, was gathered by the letter; was to be ordered by the letter; was to keep and observe the law of the letter; was to have priests and sacrifices according to the letter; but the new testament church was to be of true Jews; of Jews gathered in the power, circumcised by the power, renewed in the power. &c. So that he is not a Jew any longer, who is one outward, nor that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew who is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter. We are the circumcision, saith the Apostle, which worship God in the spirit, and have no confidence in the flesh. [The new testament state, is a state of substance, even of that "Spiritual Substance which the law held out in shadows. The Jew "is inward, the circumcision inward, the sacrifice inward, the church "inward, the ministry inward, the worship inward: all is in spirit, "in life, in power, in virtue; the whole state is answerable to the "High Priest of our profession, even after the power of the endless "life. By the eternal spirit was he made a minister, by it he preach- "ed, ('the spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed "me to preach the gospel,' &c. Luke iv. 18.) 'through it he *offered up* "himself, a sacrifice without spot to God.' Heb. ix. 14. And in the "same power runs the vein of the whole dispensation of the gospel, "for it is a ministration of the spirit. 2 Corinth. iii. 8. Take away "the life; take away the spirit; ye take away the stones of this "building; ye take away the church; ye take away the ministry; ye "take away all."—Vol. ii. pages 115, 116.

The reader will observe that there is nothing like coincidence with Elias Hicks' principles, in this extract from I. Pennington. He calls Christ Jesus, the *Eternal Son of God*; whereas Elias Hicks says, he was not the Son of God, until after the baptism of John.

I. Pennington describes him as the *substance* of all the types and shadows of the law. Elias Hicks says he was himself but a type under the law. I. Pennington asserts him to be the High Priest of our holy profession, after the power of an endless life. Elias Hicks says he was no more than an Israelite. I. Pennington declares that, through the Eternal Spirit, he offered himself up, *a sacrifice unto God for the sins of the people*: Elias Hicks says, His death was no more than that of a martyr, and that he was not an atonement for any sins but the legal sins of the Jews.

The next quotation, on pages 43, 44, of the pamphlet, is marked "Pennington on Christ," but no page given, which would enable us to refer to the part of his works, in which it was contained. So much has I. Pennington written "on Christ," and so repeatedly has he declared his full faith, in all his glorious offices and attributes; that we were not a little at a loss, where to look for the compilers' quotation. After a careful examination, however, we have at length succeeded, and unravelled the whole mystery. On a comparison of the original with the *pretended* extract, we find that they have so altered and garbled the text, that it bears, at first sight, so little resemblance to the original, that we passed it over, as not being the one we were in search of. No wonder that the compilers omitted the page whence it was manufactured; we commend them for the faint traces of shame which the concealment indicates.

It is painful to us to be obliged, again and again, to remark upon their unfair and mutilated quotations. It is wearisome and disgusting—but it is a duty we owe to the public, and to the worthy authors, whom they thus misrepresent. Such wanton and unjustifiable perversion of a writer's meaning and language, is the very worst species of detraction; because the vilified author is not present to defend himself; and by such unfair means, he may be presented to the world as holding the most unchristian principles; principles which his very soul abhorred, and which the whole tenor of his writings, his godly life, and triumphant death, directly contravened.

The extract is from the essay entitled "A question to the Professors of Christianity," &c. from which they have before given us a garbled extract. The reader will observe that the scraps which they have taken out and joined together are all enclosed in brackets.

☞["The question is not whether they know what is said of "Christ in the scriptures, but whether they know it *savingly, truly, livingly, powerfully?*"]☞ Yea they may know what is said of *him*, and yet *not know him*, of whom those things are said. As it was with ☞[the Scribes and Pharisees, they knew what was "said of Christ in the law and prophets; but they knew not him—self when he appeared in that body of flesh. So men may now "know what the apostles and the evangelists have said"]☞ concerning his appearance in a body of flesh, ☞[concerning his birth, "circumcision, baptism, preaching, doctrine, miracles, death, resurrection, ascension, intercession, &c.; and yet not know him, of "whom these things are said."]☞ Yea they may know what is said concerning the Word which was from the beginning, and yet not know the Word, the power, the life itself. Since the prevailing

of the apostles' testimony, [the way of the enemy hath not been directly to deny Christ, but to bring men into such a knowledge of Christ as saves not. And as the enemy did own Christ when he appeared in that body of flesh, saying, 'I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God;?' so he hath found it for his advantage almost ever since, to own that appearance of his. So that this he doth not oppose, nor men's knowledge and understanding of scriptures, so as to confirm them in this, but the saving knowledge, the true knowledge, the living knowledge, the powerful knowledge of truth, that he always opposeth; for that alone overturns and destroys his kingdom in man, and brings man out of his reach.]

Now there is a vast difference between knowing the relations concerning a thing, and knowing the thing related of. And there is also a great deal of difference, between believing the relations concerning a thing, and believing in the thing, which is related of.

"Spiritual things cannot be savingly known but in union with them, in the receiving of them. A man can never really know the Spirit of God by all that can be said, concerning it, but he must first feel, somewhat of it, whereby he may truly know it. So the peace, the joy, the life, the power, they pass the understanding, and a man can never rightly know them by reading, or comprehending ever so much concerning them; but by coming out of himself and travelling thither, where they are given and made manifest he may come into acquaintance with them. [And if the peace which Christ gives, the joy, the life, the power, cannot be thus known by literal descriptions, how can he who is the fulness of all] the fountain of them all, the treasury of all perfection, [in whom are hid all the riches and treasures of wisdom and knowledge, how can he be known by outward and literal descriptions?"]

Vol. iii. pages 28, 29.

It is easy to perceive what mangling of sentences and paragraphs is here made by the compilers. They might almost as well, forge an essay in Isaac Pennington's name, as thus to change and re-model one of his own. There is one part of the paragraph which we have quoted, that furnishes us with a decisive proof of I. Pennington's full belief, in the scripture testimony, to the coming, suffering, death, and various offices of Jesus Christ. At the time in which he lived, professors of religion, were so firmly established in all these points; and the necessity of believing them, was so strenuously enforced by the ministers of all denominations, that he remarks, "*since the prevailing of the apostles' testimony, the way of the enemy hath not been, directly to deny Christ.*" He considered the inspired writings of the holy Evangelists and Apostles, to be so full, clear, and indisputable, as to afford the enemy little hope of success, in tempting men to deny them. Judging from his own sincere conviction of their truth, he supposed few persons would be found, so hardened in unbelief, as to call in question the glorious manifestation of the Son of God in the flesh, or to reject the benefits of what he then did, on behalf of a lost world. Hence he argues, that as Satan found it to his advantage, to acknowledge Christ when personally among men, so it had been to the interest of his king-

dom, to appear to do so ever since, and by this stratagem to lead men into such a belief in him, as *saved not*.

But the times are altered. The enemy is ever ready to accommodate himself to circumstances, and to suit his wiles to the disposition and favourite notions of poor man. Hence he is now transforming himself into an angel of light; pretends to be a mighty advocate for the Spirit, and a great opponent of traditional believers, and letter-learned christians; and by these devout appearances, is seducing and leading away many passive and credulous followers, into an open denial of the solemn truths of holy scripture; persuading them meanwhile, that by thus denying the written testimony of the Holy Spirit, they are becoming more conformable to the inward light. But alas! they know not what Spirit they are of: they see not the cunning working of this subtle serpent. He delights in these *pretences* to the guidance of the Spirit of Truth, he glories in their boasted revelations, and clearer views, because he knows, that so long as he can feed them with these, and keep alive within them, that evil heart of unbelief which rejects the truths of Christ's gospel, so long they are securely his. So long as he can satisfy them with the *likeness*, and keep them from coming to the thing itself, it is easy to persuade them, that they are advancing in their heavenward journey, and becoming wise in the mystery of God's salvation, when in truth they are blind as the sorcerer who groped at noon-day, and are not among the number of those "babes and sucklings," to whom only, the Father revealeth the gospel of his dear Son.

Could Isaac Pennington see the use which the compilers are now making of his writings, how mournful would be his feelings. Surely he would conclude that the power of delusion had prevailed to a most fearful degree, when the professors of that religion for which he suffered so deeply, are not only denying those doctrines which he held so sacred, but are mutilating his writings, and perverting his meaning, in order to make him do the same.

On page 44 of the pamphlet, we have another quotation from the 18th chapter of Isaac Pennington's essay, entitled "Life and Immortality brought to light, &c.," a considerable portion of which, we have already quoted. The compilers have extracted only the last sentence of the concluding paragraph of the 32nd observation, omitting some preceding matter which seems necessary to explain the author's meaning. We shall transcribe the whole, viz:

"Whither they came in the apostles' days, who knew Christ as the High Priest and Mediator, and who partook of the blood of sprinkling? They came to spiritual Mount Sion, and to the city of the Living God, the heavenly Jerusalem—Heb. xii. 22. Observe, likewise, where *they* walked, who felt the virtue of Christ's blood cleansing them; which was 'in the light as God is in the light,' 1st John, i. 7."

Now, what light is that which the redeemed are to walk in? Is it not the light of the LAMB'S city; the new Jerusalem? Is it not the light thereof, that the nations of them that are saved must walk in?—Rev. xxi. 24. Yea, this light, this city, and the holy waters of the sanctuary, which flow and stream from the river of

life there, were in measure known and experienced in the days of old; which David prayed for, and experienced a sense of—Psalms xliii. 3, xlvi. 4. Yea, he knew also the blood of the everlasting covenant, praying and waiting to be sprinkled, and cleansed therewith—Psalms li. 6. For he looked through the outward figure, to what his soul needed to purge and wash it inwardly; which outward hyssop, or outward water of purification, he knew would not do; for he that saw through the outward sacrifices, to the inward, could not choose but see through these also. But that power, virtue and life of God's spirit, which could 'create a clean heart and renew a right spirit in him;' and bring him into God's presence, where he might feel the upholdings of his free spirit, and partake of the joy of God's salvation and deliverance from that which had defiled him; this was it he prayed for; knowing assuredly, he should here meet with the true hyssop, and water of life, and blood of the covenant, which purgeth the heart and conscience from dead works, and maketh it whiter than the snow in God's sight. v. 10, 11, 12. ☞☞[" For he that delighteth not in sacrifice nor burnt offerings, neither could he delight in hyssop, or water, or blood, outward or natural; but in that which melteth the heart, and purifieth the conscience, from that which is dead and unclean, in that is God's delight; and in that which is melted, broken and purified by it."]☞☞—v. 16, 17. Vol. iv. p. 129, 130.

We have next, a quotation from Isaac Pennington's answer to such as objected that the Quakers preached a new way, &c. We shall quote the paragraph at length, that the author's meaning may be better understood.

"Object. It is objected against us, that this which we testify to, hold forth, and practice, is a new way, sprung up of late, never known nor heard of in the world, till some few years ago.

Ans. The Light eternal, when it shineth out of the darkness, after the great apostacy from the spirit and life of the apostles, is new indeed to those that were overwhelmed and buried in the darkness of the night, and so never saw or heard of it before; but it is not new in itself, but the same that it was from the beginning. ☞☞[" This Seed of life, this Seed of blessing, is the same that was promised at first to bruise the serpent's head. The same which was promised to Abraham when the gospel was preached to him. The same that saved all (that believed in it) under the law; for it was not the types and shadows, and outward ordinances, which saved the soul then, but the Seed, who was the Saviour from the beginning, and is the Saviour all along, even to the end: and it was the same, which was the Gospel in the days of the Apostles. They preached the Seed also, the Word of faith; *Christ the way, Christ the power.* Yea all along the times of the apostacy, this was the thing that preserved the witnesses, saving them from being swallowed up in the darkness, and keeping them alive in their testimony. And there is no other thing held forth now, by those who are in the truth, and raised up by the power of God in it, to give testimony to it. This is it, from whence life hath sprung, in any that have felt life, in all ages and generations."]☞☞ *This is the Root and Off-*

spring of David, the bright and the morning Star. This is the Desire of all nations (Oh that they knew their desire,) and their saving health too, without which they can never be healed!"—Vol. iv. pages 12, 13.

It will be observed, that the compilers, by stopping their quotation at "generations," have omitted a very important part of Isaac Pennington's definition of that Holy Seed of life, which has been the Way to Salvation in all ages of the world. As the account stands in I. Pennington's essay, it forms a beautiful description of Him, who is "the way, the truth and the life," and who declared, "before Abraham was, I am." He is indeed "the Root and Offspring of David," an expression which acknowledges both his Godhead and manhood—the bright and the morning Star, the Desire of all nations—terms which are used in Scripture exclusively, to designate Jesus Christ the Eternal Son and sent of God.

Isaac Pennington's views will be more clearly explained, by inserting a short paragraph from the eleventh chapter of his Essay, entitled "Life and Immortality brought to light by the Gospel."—Speaking of the appearance of Christ under the Law, he says, "Various were the appearances of Christ, sometimes as an angel in the likeness of a man; so to Abraham, and so to Jacob, when Jacob wrestled with him and prevailed, and had overcome; so to Joshua, or the captain of the Lord's host, at his besieging Jericho; so to Moses in the bush, he appeared as an angel, Acts vii. 35, so likewise in visions.—Those glorious appearances of God to the prophets in visions, were the appearances of Christ; as particularly, that glorious appearance of God, sitting upon a throne, and in his train filling the temple, and the Seraphims crying "Holy! Holy! Holy is the Lord of Hosts, his glory is the fulness of the whole earth!" Isaiah vi. This was an appearance of Christ to Isaiah, as is manifest, John xii. 41. where the evangelist (relating to that place) useth this expression: "These things (said Isaiah) when he saw his glory, and spake of him."—So he was the Angel of God's presence, which went before the Jews, in all their journeyings and travels out of Egypt, through the sea and in the wilderness, and in the time of the judges; and wrought all their deliverances for them as is signified, Isaiah lxiii. 9. "In all their afflictions he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them," &c. So with the three children, he appeared in the midst of the fiery furnace, "in a form like the *Son of God*"—as Nebuchadnezzar judged. Dan. iii. 25."—Vol. iv. p. 94.

From the manner in which the primitive friends used the term Seed, to denote that holy gift of light and grace which in some measure was vouchsafed to mankind, under the former dispensations, but more fully and gloriously in this gospel day; asserting that it had, in all ages been the Saviour of men, they were accused of denying that the promise made to Adam, foretold, or was fulfilled in, the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh. Thus the "Snake in the Grass," p. 140, says, "They have evaded the most express texts, for Christ's humanity, even that, Genesis iii. 15. his being the Seed of the woman: they allegorize that too, into a spiritual sense, quite

away from the letter, and to mean nothing else in the world, but their light within." To which the author of the Switch replies,— "We have not *evaled any text of Scripture* for Christ's humanity, therefore not that of Genesis iii. 15. wherein HE is testified of, as the Seed of the woman: Nor have we allegorized it into a spiritual sense, beyond the authority of express texts of Scripture, much less quite away from the letter; but as we now do, so we always since a people, have owned that it did mean something more than the manifestation of the Spirit or Light of Christ in man."

The Snake to prove his charge, quoted a paragraph from W. P.'s Christian Quaker (see works, Vol. i. p. 572.) in which he states that as the serpent was a spirit, so nothing could bruise his head, but something internal and spiritual, &c. The author of the Switch recites the passage, and adds—

"Thus W. P. from which the Snake says, his consequence is, that that the promised Seed, was not any person, but a principle. Which consequence is falsely drawn by the Snake from W. P.'s words; the consequence of them being more truly, that the promised Seed was not only *that*, but *also* a principle of light, life and power, which I shall now further show, as it is also declared by T. Ellwood (Truth Defended, p. 113, 114.) "That the scope and design of W. P. in those words, was to prove, against his opponents, that the Son of God, who in the fulness of time took upon him a body of flesh, in which he suffered on the cross, was, and was properly called, Christ, before he appeared in that outward body; which his opponents denied, not owning Christ as Christ, to have any existence before that body, which was born of the virgin, but confining Christ to that body. And because all acknowledge, the promised seed, to be Christ, William Penn used *that* as a medium to prove that Christ was before that outward appearance. Now this affirming Christ to be the Seed, and that seed to be inward and spiritual, is not a denial of Christ having a bodily existence without us, for he *may have, and hath*, a bodily existence without us; and yet may be, and is, spiritually within us: it is true he denied, that that body, which Christ had from the virgin, strictly considered as such was the Seed, and he gave divers reasons for it, and which are mentioned page 94, &c."

"From the consequence, which the Snake hath falsely drawn from William Penn's words: viz. that the Seed is not a person but a principle; He goes on fighting against the bugbear which himself hath conjured up, and declares it to be a supposition of so pernicious a nature, that it unchristians any who hold it; for the faith of christians is built upon that man Jesus Christ, as the seed promised to bruise the serpent's head.

"His supposition, so far as respecting us, the Quakers, and William Penn, in particular, is false: "For we believe the manhood of Christ, gloriously united with the Godhead, to be the Seed promised. Genesis iii. 15; and also that that Seed, being of a divine and spiritual nature, did inwardly work against the serpent, and did bruise his head, and break his strength and power in some measure, in the holy men and women, in all generations." (T. E. Truth Defended.

page 114. ;) and by this, their inward experience of his spirit and power, he was the object of their faith, to be made manifest in God's due time. And he is now, the object of the faith of all true Christians; not only as born of the virgin, &c. but also as known and witnessed in his inward and spiritual appearance in man, to bruise the serpent's head, power and strength, which has had dominion and rule in man. To this sense, our Saviour himself, does also explain the spiritual nature of the seed, the Word of God, Luke viii. 11.—*Switch for the Snake*, pages 212 to 215.

The next quotation of the compilers from I. Pennington, is inserted on page 45, of their pamphlet. It is from an essay entitled "An Examination of the Grounds and Causes which are said to induce the Court of Boston, to make that order or law of banishment upon pain of death, against the Quakers." To the charge that they deny the person of Christ, he replies, as quoted by the compilers, viz :

☞ "They, [the Quakers,] believe that Christ is the eternal
 "Light, Life, Wisdom, and Power of God, which was manifested in
 "that body of flesh which he took of the virgin: that he is the King,
 "Priest, and Prophet of his people, and saveth them from their sins
 "by laying down his life for them, and imputing his righteousness
 "to them; yet not without revealing and bringing forth the same
 "righteousness in them, which he wrought for them. And by ex-
 "perience they know, that there is no being saved, by a belief of his
 "death for them, and of his resurrection, ascension, intercession,
 "&c., without being brought into a true fellowship with him in his
 "death, and without feeling his immortal seed of life raised and
 "living in them. And so they disown the faith in Christ's death,
 "which is only received and entertained, from the relation of the
 "letter of the scriptures, and stands not in the divine power, and
 "sensible experience of the begotten of God in the heart.

"Now they distinguish according to the scriptures, between that
 "which is called the Christ, and the bodily garment which he took,*
 "The one was flesh, the other spirit. 'The flesh profiteth nothing,
 "(saith he,) the spirit quickeneth, and he that eateth me shall live by
 "me, even as I live by the Father,' John vi. 57, 63. This is the man-
 "na itself, the true treasure; the other, but the visible or earthen
 "vessel which held it. The body of flesh was but the veil, Heb. x. 20.
 "The eternal life, was the substance veiled. The one he did partake
 "of, as the rest of the children did; the other was he which did par-
 "take thereof, Heb. ii. 14. The one was the body which was prepared
 "for the life, for it to appear in, and be made manifest, Heb. x. 5. The
 "other was the life or light itself, for whom the body was prepared,
 "who took it up, appeared in it to do the will, Psal. xl. 7, 8, and was
 "made manifest to those eyes which were able to see through the
 "veil, wherewith it was covered, John i. 14." ☞ Vol. i. page 360.

It needs not much comment, to convince any reasonable person, who has any acquaintance with the doctrines of Elias Hicks, that this extract from I. Pennington, is totally at variance with them.

* We have already given an explanation of the meaning of the early Qua-
 kers, in the use of the words garment and veil. See our 112th page.

It is one that we should have selected to show that he, [E. H.] had swerved from the ancient faith of the Quakers. I. Pennington declares in it, their belief in the Eternity, Divinity, and Manhood of the Lord Jesus Christ—acknowledging his miraculous conception—his laying down his life a sacrifice for sinners, and imputing his righteousness to believers, “yet not without revealing and bringing forth the same righteousness *in them*, which he wrought for them;” and that he is the King, Priest, and Prophet of his people. How different is this christian belief, from the notions of Elias Hicks, who denies the divinity, the miraculous conception, and the atonement of Jesus Christ, and declares the doctrine of the imputation of his righteousness to be wicked and absurd.

I. Pennington says, the Quakers disown that faith in Christ’s death, which is *only* received and entertained from the letter of the scriptures; and stands not in the divine power and sensible experience of the begotten of God in the heart. The compilers have made the word *disown* emphatical, as though they would make it appear that the Quakers denied all faith in the blood of Christ—but it alludes only to that mere literal faith, which is not accompanied by works of obedience; and while they reject this, they have always sincerely owned that faith in the propitiatory sacrifice, mediation, and intercession of our blessed Lord, which *does* stand in the divine power and sensible experience of the Holy Spirit. This Elias Hicks rejects, and consequently denies and condemns that very doctrine which the “primitive Friends,” so strongly recommended.

The next extract is found in an essay entitled, “Some Queries concerning Christ and his appearances; his taking upon him flesh, &c.” which he thus commences:

“Query 1.—Whether there was not a necessity of Christ’s taking upon him our flesh, for the redemption of those that had sinned, and the satisfaction of the justice offended?”

“Query 2.—Whether the Father did not, accordingly, prepare a body for him, to do his will in all things in; and *particularly to offer up* to him, the *acceptable sacrifice for the sins of the whole world*?”

“Query 3.—Whether it was not necessary, in this respect also, that Christ should take upon him our flesh, that he might have experience of our temptations, and infirmities, and become a merciful and faithful High Priest and Intercessor for us?”

“Query 4.—Wherein lay the value and worth of his sacrifice, and of all he did? Did it lie chiefly on the thing done, or in the life wherein he did it; in that he did it, in the pure faith and obedience to the Father. He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; and he, through the Eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God.

“Query 5.—What was He, for whom the Father prepared a body, and who took it up to do the will, and did the will in it? Was He not the Arm of God, the power of God, the Saviour and Salvation of God, the Jesus and Christ of God?”—Vol. iii. pages 45, 46.

The compilers have selected as best adapted to their purpose, the twenty-fourth Query, viz:

“Is not the substance, the life, the anointing, called Christ,

“wherever it is found? Doth not the name belong to the whole body.
 “(and every member in the body,) as well as to the Head? Are they
 “not all of one; yea, all one in the anointing? Was not this the
 “great desire of his heart to the Father, that they all might be one,
 “even as the Father and Christ were one, John xvii. 21, 23? And
 “so being one in the same spirit, (one in the same life, one in the
 “same divine nature, 2 Peter, i, 4, even partakers of God’s holi-
 “ness, Heb. xii. 10.) Christ is not ashamed to call them brethren,
 “Heb. ii. 11. nor is the apostle ashamed to give them the name
 “Christ, together with him, 1 Cor. xii. 12. The body is the same
 “with the head, one and the same in nature; and doth not the name
 “belong to *the nature* in the whole? So that the name is *not given*
 “to the vessel, but to the nature, to the heavenly treasure, to that
 “which is of *him*, in the vessel, to that which the Lord from Heaven
 “begets in his own image, and likeness of his own substance, of
 “his own seed, of his own spirit and pure life”]—Vol. iii. page
 54.

I. Pennington, as is very plain to be understood, is here speaking of the oneness *in nature*, of that spirit or grace of God, which is in the hearts of all true believers, and of their *unity* in it. Thus he says, they are one in the anointing, in the divine life and nature; and the divine anointing, life or nature, is one in all. The name, Christ, he says, is not given to the vessel—to the creature, but to the heavenly treasure, which we have in our earthen vessels; and hence he cites the Apostle’s expression, in Corinthians, to show that he gives this divine spirit or nature in all, the same name, calling it Christ; the same in nature, but not in degree, in the Head and all the members. The text is, “For as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ, for by one spirit we are all baptised into one body.”—1 Cor. xii. 12.

The compilers have italicised the word *Christ*, where I. Pennington speaks of its application to the body or church of Christ, by the Apostle; as though they would have us think, he thereby meant to equal men with their Saviour; but that I. Pennington was very far from any such intention, is obvious from the glorious attributes which he gives him, in the extracts we have already made, as well as the following quotation out of the same essay.

“Now, as the Father sent the Son, and yet was with and in the Son; so the Son sending the spirit, he also is with and in the spirit. And as it is the Father’s will, that the same honour be given to the Son, as is given to Him; so it is the Son’s pleasure, that the same honour be given to his spirit, as is given to him. Yea, as he that will worship the Father *must worship the Son*, must come to him *in the Son*, must appear before him *in the Son*, must reverence and kiss *the Son*, so he that will come to Christ, *will worship him*, must come to him in the spirit, must bow to him in the spirit. Yea, he that will know and *worship Christ in his fulness*, (in the *majesty of his glory, dominion and power*.) must learn to bow, at the lowest appearance of his light and spirit, even at the *very feet of Jesus*; for that is the lowest part of the body.”—Vol. iii. page 50

The early opponents of the Society of Friends charged them with applying the name Christ, to the members of his church, as meaning to equal them with him, the Holy Head; but they always positively denied any such meaning. Thus, the Snake says, page 125, "But for the same reason, they take the name Christ to themselves, and say that it belongs to them, as well as to Jesus," &c. To which Joseph Wyeth thus replies; "Jesus Christ, when he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and did give gifts unto men; the gifts of his holy spirit, of which the apostle hath testified, Ephes. iv. 7. But unto every one of us is given grace, according to the *measure* of the gift of Christ. Thus much, we have often declared, and that truly: *but it is falsely* said and charged, that we take the name of Christ to ourselves, or say it belongs to us in any other manner than in these and other scriptures is mentioned. We say that Christ, by his ascension into glory, hath given the gift of his spirit to men, to which, as they are obedient, they will witness the power of the spirit of Christ in them, to bring every thought into subjection; and when, through the assistance of this spirit, they thus have got the victory over their own corruptions and lusts, they will truly say, It is no more I, but Christ in me; yet the name Christ cannot hereby be supposed to belong to such, *nor was it ever said by any of us*, that it did belong to us, in such manner as to Jesus; for to him it belongs by origination, to us only by participation, through him: for he, by partaking of our nature, made thereby mankind partakers of his spirit; (I say this with respect to the generality of the gospel dispensation, for there were many particular persons, not within the covenant of the law in the time of the law, who had manifestations of the spirit of Christ,) and in no other sense have we ever taken the name of Christ to ourselves."—Switch, page 194.

To the same unfounded accusation George Whitehead replies:

"But even in the same article, quoted against me, *I do not allow* any member to be called Christ, but expressly disallow it, though I confess how Christians have *some interest* in his name, but not to be called Jesus, but *Christians*. The explanatory part of my confession in the said tenth article, *disingenuously left out* by this scoffer, is in these words, viz. But that the divine anointing, (to which name Christ hath relation,) virtually is, *in some measure or degree*, afforded to every member of his body, but not so amply as to him, the head; nor for any member to be called Christ, but a Christian, because Christ received the anointing, the Holy Spirit, *not by measure*, but in fulness, and because he is the Head of the body, the church."—Supplement to the Switch, page 490.

To the charge that the Quakers give to themselves, and to one another, the most peculiar titles of Christ, as that of the Branch, and the Star, and the Son of God, &c. George Whitehead replies:

"Here this credulous adversary has accepted and promoted Bugg's false quotation and charge against us, though over and over detected, as *his notorious refuted lies*, which this adversary is, (as 'tis told him in the Antidote,) so shamefully credulous of; and that we *positively deny* giving those peculiar titles of Christ, to ourselves.

ousness which Christ giveth them, their righteousness? What was Christ's righteousness? Was it not the righteousness of God revealed in him, communicated to him, and made his? And what is their righteousness? Is not the same righteousness revealed in them, communicated to them, and made theirs, in and by Christ? Are not they made partakers of the divine nature, *in and through him*; and made the righteousness of God *in him*? [Christ trusted his "Father, and obeyed his Father in all things. Now was not that "an effect of the righteous nature and spirit of his Father in him? "He became obedient *unto death, even the death of the cross*—and "Oh! how was his Father pleased therewith! Did not he say to "him, as to Abraham in the like case? "Because thou hast done "*this thing, in blessing I will bless thee,*] and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed, and thou shalt see of the travail of thy soul and be satisfied? for thou shalt not only gather the 'dispersed of Israel;' but 'inherit the Gentiles' also; 'and have the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.'"—Vol. iv. pages 303, 304.

Let the reader particularly notice the unhandsome manner in which the compilers have treated this worthy christian. They close their quotation from his essay with an &c. stopping at a semicolon, in the midst of an important sentence, where I. Pennington is expressing the Father's good pleasure in the obedience of the Son, in offering up his precious life, a sacrifice for sinners; and is reciting, and applying to Christ, some of those beautiful passages in the Prophets, where the propitiatory offering, and subsequent glory and dominion of our blessed Lord are so clearly set forth. Such omissions evince, but too clearly, that the compilers are willing, on all occasions, to rob the Saviour of those sublime expressions, which characterize him as the mighty God, and the Prince of Peace.

As the compilers, in the course of their extracts, have evinced a determination to make it appear, if possible, that Isaac Pennington allegorized away the outward offering of the body of Jesus Christ for sin, and esteemed that body no more than common flesh and blood; we think it proper to quote some observations of I. Pennington's, in reply to Thomas Hicks, who most unjustly accused him of the same unchristian sentiments.

"In the second part of Thomas Hicks' 'Dialogues,' called 'Continuation,' page 4, he maketh his personated Quaker speak thus: 'Thou sayest we account the blood of Christ, no more than a common thing; yea, no more than the blood of a common thief.' To which he makes his personated christian answer thus: 'Isaac Pennington, (who I suppose is an approved Quaker,) asks this question; Can outward blood cleanse? Therefore, saith he, we must inquire, whether it was the blood of the veil, that is, of the human nature, or the blood within the veil, viz. of that spiritual man, consisting of flesh, blood, and bones, which took on him the veil, or human nature. It is not the blood of the veil, that is but outward; and can outward blood cleanse?'"

I. Pennington, after noticing Thomas Hicks' unfairness, in *making him speak what he never intended*, respecting the spiritual man, Christ Jesus, &c. adds—

And then, besides his alterations at the beginning, putting in only four words of my query, and leaving out that which next follows, (*which might have manifested my drift and intent in them,*) he puts in an affirmation which was not mine, in these his own words: 'It is not the blood of the veil, that is but outward;' and then annexeth to this affirmation of his own, the words of my former query, 'Can outward blood cleanse?' as if these words of mine, (can outward blood cleanse,) did necessarily infer, that the blood of Christ is but a *common thing*.

'Herein he represents *me wicked*, and makes me speak, by his *changing and adding*, that which *never was in my heart*, and the contrary whereto, I have several times affirmed in that *very book*, where those several queries were put, out of which he forms this his own query, *giving it forth* in my name. For in the tenth page of that book, beginning at line third, I *positively affirm* thus; That Christ did offer up *the flesh and blood of that body*, (though not only so, for he poured out his soul, he poured out his life) a sacrifice or offering for sin, a sacrifice unto the Father, and *in it*, tasted death for every man; and that it is *upon consideration*, (and through God's *acceptance of this sacrifice for sin*,) that the sins of believers are pardoned, that God might be just, and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus, or who is of the faith of Jesus. *Is this common flesh and blood? Can this be affirmed of common flesh and blood? Ought not he to have considered this; [and ought not the compilers too,] and other passages in my book, of the same tendency, and not thus have reproached me, and misrepresented me to the world? Is this a christian spirit; or according to the law or prophets, or Christ's doctrine? Doth he herein do as he would be done by? Oh! that he had a heart to consider it!*

'I might also except against these words; 'Human nature,' (*which he twice putteth in,*) being not my words, nor indeed my sense; for by human nature as I judge, is understood *more than the body*; whereas I, by the word veil, intended *no more than the flesh*, (or *outward body*,) which in scripture, is expressly so called, Heb. x. 20. 'through the veil, that is to say, his flesh.'—Vol. iii. pages 406, 407, 408.

In the preface to this reply to the aspersions of Thomas Hicks, I. Pennington says, 'I have had experience of that despised people, [the Quakers.] for many years, and I have often heard them, *even the ancient ones* of them, own Christ both *inwardly and outwardly*. Yea, I heard one of the ancients of them, thus testify in a public meeting, many years since, that if Christ had not come in the flesh, in the fulness of time, to bear our sins, in *his own body* on the tree, and to offer himself up a sacrifice for mankind, all mankind had utterly perished. What cause then have we to praise the Lord God for sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for what his Son *did therein!* Oh! professors, *do not pervert our words*, by reading them with a prejudiced mind, *quite contrary to the drift of God's Spirit by us!* If ye should thus read the Holy Scriptures, yea, the very words of Christ himself therein, and *give that wisdom of yours, which fights against us*, scope to comment upon them, and

perverts them after this manner, what a strange and hideous appearance of untruth and contradiction, to the very scriptures of the Old Testament, might ye make, of *that wonderful appearance of God?* For the words of Christ seemed so foolish and impossible to the *wise men* of that age, that they frequently contradicted, and sometimes derided him.”—Pages 403, 404.

This forcible and earnest expostulation with the former opponents of the Society, is so directly applicable to the compilers of the pamphlet, that it forms of itself, both a contradiction to the sentiments which they would force upon the primitive Friends, and a severe, though just rebuke, for the means which they have resorted to, in order to effect their purpose. On the same page I. Pennington adds :

“Oh! T. Hicks, dost thou believe the eternal judgment at the great day? Not outwardly only in notion, but *inwardly in heart!* Oh! then consider, how thou wilt *answer it to God*, for saying so many things in the name of a people, as their belief and words, which never were spoken by any one of them, nor ever came into any one of their hearts!! Innocency in me, Life in me, Truth in me, the christian spirit and nature in me, is a witness against thee, that thou wrotest thy dialogues, *out of the christian nature and spirit*; and thy brethren, W. K. and the rest, who have *stood by thee*, to justify thee, (or at least seemed so to do,) must take notice of these things, and condemn them in thee, or they will *expose themselves and their religion, to the righteous judgment of God, and of all who love truth, and HATE FORGERY AND DECEIT.*”

The next extract on page 48, is from an essay, “Concerning the True Church, and Ministry;” in which I. Pennington says, three things are necessary; to the right qualification of true gospel ministers, which he proceeds to treat of, in as many sections. The first of these sections, the compilers have quoted and joined to it, only the heading of the second. The extract does not appear to relate, in any way, to the controversy about Elias Hicks’ doctrines, being merely a statement of the necessity of a divine call to the ministry of the gospel, and an obedience to the call, in that ability which comes from God.

The two quotations next following, on page 53, are taken from the preface to a treatise entitled, “The New Covenant of the Gospel distinguished from the Old Covenant of the Law,” &c., in which the author sets forth the great advantage of reading the sacred volume, with a mind, illuminated by a portion of the same Holy Spirit, that gave the scriptures forth, and laments the great loss which professors sustain, by reading them without this. The compilers appear to have quoted the sentences in their pamphlet with a view to show, that he considered the Holy Scriptures to be of little value, when the teachings of the spirit were come to, but in this I. Pennington himself contradicts them. As they have not done him justice in their quotation, we shall extend it a little, in order to give his true meaning.

“Oh! how long have christians, (so called,) *wanted the Spirit!* [How have they wearied themselves, in running to and fro, about the letter to *find out* the mind of God, and are still unsatis-

ified concerning it, and even drowned in fleshly imaginations, and "contentions about it."] They seek to have *that* satisfied which is *not* to be satisfied: they seek to have *that* know, which is *not* to know: they offer to God the service, faith, and obedience of *that* which he will not accept, and keep that from him which he calls for. They seek for the *spirit in the letter*, according to the manner of the law; but *wait not* to feel it in the seed, quickening the seed, raising up the seed, and dwelling in the seed, whither Christ and his apostles directed to wait for it."—Vol. ii. pages 35, 36.

He goes on to describe the various kinds of knowledge, which men have gathered by their own unenlightened reason and wisdom, in *opposition* to the Holy Spirit; declaring that the true knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ, which gives Life Eternal, can only be obtained from the Holy Spirit itself: and then adds:

"These are strange things to the several generations of the christians of this age, who commonly know no more of them, than according to the apprehensions they have taken in concerning them; *even from that wisdom and understanding which hath not a capacity in it, to receive them, but must be destroyed*, before these things can be understood aright, I Cor. i. 19. Oh, that ye *could read*, in the eternal light of life. [Oh! christians, christians! Oh! that ye could see how your understandings and knowledge from the letter, stand as much in your way as ever the Jews did in theirs; and must be broken down as flat as ever theirs was, before the foundation of the kingdom can be laid, and the building of eternal life reared up in your hearts.]"

By closing the quotation here, the compilers have left I. Pennington's meaning obscure, whereas it will be seen by the following, that it was *not* the scriptures which he was contending against, but *that knowledge of them*, which opposed the Holy Spirit; for he adds:

"Be not offended at my zeal for the Lord my God, and for your souls. It hath cost me very dear, what I testify to you in the simplicity and integrity of my heart; and this I know to be most certainly true, that that *spirit of man*, which, *without the leadings* of the eternal light, hath nestled itself in the letter, got a seat of wisdom and knowledge there, raised up a building from thence, either of inward or outward worship, will be dissettled and driven thence, *even by that very spirit which gave forth the letter*. 'And when this is done, and God's spirit again *openeth the letter*, Oh! *how sweet, how profitable, how clear, how refreshing, will it be*, being read in the light of the spirit, and in the faith which is in Christ Jesus, which is begotten in the heart by the word of faith which is nigh there."—Vol. iii. pages 35, 36, 37.

We have here, another specimen of the great injustice of the quotations made in the pamphlet, and the violence which is done thereby to the author's meaning.

At the top of page 54, we are presented with a quotation from I. Pennington, for which we are referred to his second volume, page 310. Upon examination, we find that the compilers have taken parts of two paragraphs from different essays, and different pages of his work, and joined them together as one. The first paragraph is

from an essay, entitled "Some Queries to the Strict and Zealous Professors of this age, *such as stick in the letter, but are strangers to the life and power*; to provoke them to jealousy," &c., in which he treats of the superior glory of this gospel dispensation; and the necessity of going beyond the law of Moses, into an obedience to the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus.—On page 362, he says:

"Is there any uniting with God, or enjoying of God, but by his spirit? Is there any receiving of God's spirit, but within the heart? Doth he not appear there, by his light, and in his power? What if God please to give forth *a measure* of his eternal light, in the heart of his chosen, to open *that* to them, which they could never see before, and to bring them into a nearer unity with them, than ever they knew before; may he not do it? Nay, is not such a thing *needful*, to help out of the deep and intricate apostacy, wherein have been so many twistings and twinings of the subtil serpent, about every step or appearance of reformation; and to gather the wandering sheep who were scattered up and down, and sorely distressed for want of the tongue of the learned, to speak a word in season, to their states and conditions? [Have not every sort bent the scriptures, "in the *reasonings of their own minds*, and *made them speak* according to their own hearts' lusts? And is not every one *wise in his own eyes*, and strong in *his own tower and fenced city*? Surely there "was great need of an appearance of the Lord, to shut out the "wisdom of man, and to help the poor, the needy, the fatherless, "the weak panting babes.] And blessed be the Lord God, who hath appeared; and blessed are those, who have seen his light, and bowed at the feet of his living appearance, and felt the virtue of his saving arm, scattering their lusts and corruptions; yea, also raising up, and bringing forth, his pure seed in the fresh power, dominion, and authority of his perfect life, which reigneth in the hearts, which the Lord hath regenerated and sanctified for ever more."—Vol. ii. pages 362, 363.

It will be remembered that these queries were addressed by I. Pennington, "To the Strict and Zealous Professors of his age, who *stuck in the letter*, but were *strangers to the life and power*." He is speaking to those, whose dependence was placed entirely upon outward means, for all the religion they possessed; and who, in opposition to the light of the glorious gospel, which in a remarkable manner, then appeared in that nation, were withstanding the day of their visitation. Hence he was led to inculcate the necessity of humbly and simply receiving the grace and spirit of God extended to all, declaring that they, and they only, who thus received and obeyed it, were true believers in Christ Jesus. Is it not too obvious, that some in *this day*, as well as in *that*, are striving to "bend the scriptures, in the reasonings of their own minds, and to make them speak" a language, accordant with their own impure designs, and when they find the testimony of those sacred records too plain and positive to admit of their false glosses, are denying it altogether.

For the remainder of the paragraph, we must turn to page 309 of this volume. It is taken from the postscript to "Some questions

and answers for the direction, help, and furtherance of God's Spiritual Israel, &c." In this postscript, he urges "four propositions relating to the right knowledge of the things of God;" the first of which is, "That the knowledge of the things of God, comes from the Spirit. *As the scriptures themselves came from the Spirit, so the true knowledge of them, is alone given, to any man which receiveth it, by the same Spirit. And no man living can know the mind, of the words which the Spirit spake, but as the same Spirit which spake them, gives the meaning of them.*" On the same page, in his third proposition, he has the words quoted by the compilers, viz: "Likewise, [in my reading of the scriptures, I lay open to this great snare, of reading in my own will, and of gathering from thence in mine own understanding, and so growing wise concerning the things of God, after the flesh: for though at that time, I was not without living knowledge, and experiences of God, yet I knew not how to turn from the death, nor to keep to the life; and so the bad, the lean, the earthly, the ill-favoured, overgrew the good, and well-pleasing to God, and brought it into bitter misery and death.] Oh! that ye knew, being begotten of the will of the Father, and keeping to the will of the Father, and receiving the bread daily from his hand!"—Pages 309, 310.

The meaning of Isaac Pennington in these remarks is so clear, that none but those who were determined not to understand him aright, could mistake it. The evil which he writes against, is *wresting the scriptures*, according to the corrupt reason of men, and turning away from the Holy Spirit which livingly opens the true sense and purport of them, and gives infallible demonstration that they are of divine authority.

Immediately after the foregoing quotation, on page 54, we have a few lines taken from an essay, called "Life and Immortality brought to light by the gospel," &c. Isaac Pennington is pointing out the cause of the difference, between the views of Friends, and many other professors of their day, in doing which, he says:—

"And truly, this is the ground of the great difference between us and others, about the things of God; for though *we own the same things*, and speak of the same things, yet we own them not alike, nor speak of them alike. Why so? Because we see them with different eyes, and so have a different sense of them. [Others call things true, and so acknowledge them, as they apprehend them from the letter; *we* call things true, as they are demonstrated to us by God's Spirit, and as we feel the virtue, life and power of them, from God in our hearts."]—Vol iv. p. 176.

The next quotation on page 54, is from the same treatise: The compilers have mutilated it, in such a manner, that it does not convey the true meaning of the author. It is taken from the 18th chapter, in which he is describing the condition which he and many others were in, when it pleased the Lord to reveal his Spirit in their hearts; and also his gracious dealings with them, in bringing them out of it. The parts which the compilers have taken out, are enclosed in brackets, designated with a hand.

“ There are chambers of imagery, in many people ; and strong holds, and reasonings, and imaginations, and high thoughts, *exalted above* the pure seed ; and measure of life in their hearts. For every true christian, every true believer, hath received somewhat of Christ’s Spirit, some *proportion* of grace and truth, *from the fulness of Christ*, which is as leaven and salt, to leaven the heart, and season the mind and Spirit with.

“ But all do not distinctly know this, nor are all that do know it, subject to it ; so that this doth not lead, and command, and rule in all ; but there is somewhat which holds captive, and the enemy of the soul hath the rule, and dominion in many men’s spirits, professing godliness ; whereby the seed is kept under in them, and their souls kept back from that redemption, and deliverance which they should partake of, in and with the seed. So [many talk of the “ gospel and speak great words of Christ, and redemption by him, “ who knew not immortality brought to light, nor the dead raised by “ it, to live to God and praise his name.

“ Now in these chambers of imagery, in these strong holds, there “ are many pleasant pictures, many images of the heavenly things, “ which men form in their minds, from their *own apprehendings and “ conceivings upon the scriptures*. For men reading the scriptures, “ *not in the life*, Spirit, and Power, *which gave them forth* ; but with “ that *which is natural*, they come not to the true, pure, heavenly, “ living knowledge, but only obtain a *natural knowledge*, according “ to which they believe and worship ; and so fall down before, and “ according to, the apprehensions and imaginations of their own “ minds ; and so one believes and worships one way, and another “ believes and worships another way. And truly, here men wor- “ ship they know not what ; but they that are the true Jews, know “ what they worship : for salvation is of the true Jews ; who wor- “ ship neither at this mountain, nor at the other mountain ; but on- “ ly in spirit and in truth,] *even in the life and power of our Lord Jesus Christ.*”—Vol. iv. pages 131, 132.

We have here another instance of garbling : The compilers begin to quote after a conjunction, which connects the sentence with what precedes, taking in only two lines of a paragraph, and connecting it with the one following, in order to make the expression “ chambers of imagery,” apply to “ speaking of Christ, and redemption by him, without knowing his power ;” doubtless thinking, thereby to cast some slight upon the doctrine of Christian redemption. The most remarkable mutilation, however, is their closing their extract at a *comma*, when they are within eleven words, not only of the end of the sentence, but the termination of the whole paragraph. From this circumstance, we may suppose they have a particular antipathy to these few words, the reason of which must be the same that Locke gives, why some men are so opposed to the scriptures. *The words being against them, they are against the words.* The matter is, that the words inculcate a doctrine which they, with Elias Hicks seem determined not to believe, viz : The Divinity of our blessed Lord ; and the manner in which they have *clipped them off*, and shut up the sentence with a period ; as if it were com-

plete, is a mortifying proof, of the littleness and selfishness, of the human mind, even in things professedly religious.

The next quotation is from Isaac Pennington's "Short Catechism for the Sake of the Simple hearted," in which he treats particularly, upon the lost condition of man in the fall, and the necessity of a divine power to redeem him out of it; declaring that this power is the Spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ, inwardly revealed, destroying the works of sin and changing the sinful nature. He earnestly recommends to all professors, a close attention, and humble obedience, to the manifestation of this Holy Spirit in the soul, endeavouring to draw them from such a dependence upon the mere literal knowledge derived from reading the Scriptures, as diverts them from this heavenly teacher. But it will be seen how far he is from undervaluing the Scriptures, as he asserts in the extract made by the compilers, that the "saving knowledge of Christ" "is also revealed in the Scriptures," as well as by the spirit of Christ in the heart, but that professors, too generally, by looking for *nothing further than the letter*, miss of it and cannot see it.

The part which the compilers seem to lay the most stress upon, is the conclusion of the answer to the second question, viz:—
 ☞ ["But now *this principle* is made manifest, their reading and "setting up a knowledge of the Scriptures *without this*, (which was "the thing, even then, from whence they had their life) *yea, in opposition to this*; *this* increaseth their death and bondage, and shuts "them out of life.] ☞—Vol. i. page 141.

The last twelve words they have italicised, as though they would have us understand, that Isaac Pennington thereby sets aside the use of the Scriptures, since the spirit was poured forth. But it is evident that he is alluding *only to that use* of the Sacred volume which is in opposition to the Holy Spirit; which qualification destroys any hope of support which the compilers might have had from it. So in the next query and answer, where he asks "wilt thou keep to the Scriptures *in opposition to that light*, which alone, can give the knowledge of the Scriptures?" it is plainly to be seen, that it is the abuse, and not the reverent and christian perusal of the Holy Bible, to which he objects. It is reading it with an intention to gather therefrom, a knowledge which is opposed to the Spirit of Christ.

On the same page of the pamphlet, we are presented with a quotation from an essay, entitled "An Examination of the grounds and causes, which are said to induce the Court of Boston, in New England, to make that order or law of banishment against the Quakers." The third of these grounds or causes, was, that the Quakers denied the Holy Scripture to be *the perfect rule of faith and life*; to which Isaac Pennington replies—

☞ ["The new covenant is the covenant of the Gospel, which "is a living covenant, a *spiritual* covenant, an inward covenant, and "the law or rule of it, cannot be written outwardly. Read the tenor "of the new covenant, Heb. viii. 10. 'I will put my laws into their "minds, and write them in their hearts.' If God himself should "take the same laws, and write them outwardly, yet so written

“ they are not the new covenant, at most they would be but an outward draft of laws, written in the New Covenant.”] And mark, this is one difference given between the new covenant and the old; the laws of the one were written outwardly in tables of stone, the laws of the other were to be written in the heart. That is the book wherein the laws of the new covenant, were promised to be written, and there they are to be read. So that he that will read and obey the laws of the covenant of life, must look for them in that book, wherein God hath promised to write them; for though in other books he may read some outward descriptions of the thing, yet here alone, can he read the thing itself. “ Christ is the way, the truth, and the life.” What is a Christian’s rule? Is not the way of God his rule? Is not God’s truth his rule? And is not the truth in Jesus, where it is taught, and to be heard, and to be received, even *as it is in Jesus?* Ephes. iv. 22. Is not he the King, the Priest, the Prophet, the Sacrifice, the Way to God, the Life itself, the Living Path out of Death; yea, *all in all* to the believer, whose eye is opened to behold him? The Scriptures *testify of Christ*, but they are not Christ; they also *testify of truth*, and *are a true testimony*, but the Truth, itself, is in Jesus; who, by his living spirit, writes it in the heart, which he hath made living. And so a Christian’s life is in the spirit: ‘If we live in the spirit, let us also walk in the spirit,’ Gal. v. 25. The whole life and course of a Christian, is in the volume of that book, as the Lord opens the leaves of it, in him. The gift of God, the measure of faith, given him by God, that is his rule; that is his rule of knowledge, of prophesying, of obedience, Heb. xii. Rom. i. 4. xii. 6. If he keep there, if he walk according to the proportion of it, he errs not; but out of the faith, in the error, in all he knows, in all he believes, in all he does.”—Vol. i. pages 361, 362.

We have enclosed the part of this paragraph extracted by the compilers, in brackets, designated with a hand. It will be seen that they have omitted the most important part of the examination into this subject: a part, in which Isaac Pennington declares Jesus Christ, to be King, Priest, Prophet, Sacrifice, the Way, the Truth, and the Life; yea *ALL in ALL* to the believer; and that the Scriptures, are *a true testimony of Christ* and of *the Truth*; although they are not Christ himself. We cannot be at any loss to decide, why the compilers omitted this paragraph:—the doctrines it contains, are too scriptural and christian, to answer their purpose; and hence they have suppressed the whole and joined the preceding and following parts of the paragraph together, as though they were immediately connected in Isaac Pennington’s works, *which is not the case*, as they are separated by that portion which they omit. They then give us the following:

☞ “The new creature, that which God hath new created in the heart, in which life breathes, and nothing but life breathes, which is taught by God, and true to God, from its very infancy; that is his rule whereby he is to walk; the apostle expressly calls it so—Gal. vi. 15, 16. That which is begotten by God is a Son, and the Son, as he is begotten by the breath of the Spirit, so he

" is preserved and led by the same breath, and such as are so led are
 " sons, and none else; for it is not reading of scriptures, and gather-
 " ing rules out thence, that makes a son; but the receiving of the
 " Spirit, and the being led by the Spirit—Rom. viii. 14, 15. And
 " being, the whole worship of the gospel, is in the Spirit, there is a
 " necessity of receiving that in the first place, and then in it the
 " soul learns to know and wait for its breathings and movings, and
 " follows on towards the Lord in them. 'The Spirit cannot be with-
 " held from breathing on that which he hath begotten, and that breath
 " is a guide, a rule, a way, to that which it breatheth upon. Now
 " this is most manifest, even from the scriptures themselves; they
 " expressly calling Christ the way, the truth, &c. the new creature,
 " the rule, the faith, grace, or gift given to be the rule, testifying the
 " heart to be that, which God hath chosen to write his laws in; but
 " when do they call themselves a *perfect rule* of faith and obedience?
 " They are they, (saith Christ,) which testify of me: and ye will
 " not come to me that ye might have life—John v. 39, 40. Life
 " cannot be received from the scriptures, but only from Christ the
 " fountain thereof; no more can the scriptures give the rule, but
 " *point to the fountain*, of the same life, where alone the rule of life,
 " as the life itself, can be received. The scriptures cannot ingraft
 " into Christ, nor give a living rule to him that is ingrafted; but *he*
 " *that hath heard the testimony of the scriptures*, concerning Christ,
 " and hath come to him, must abide in him, and wait on him, for the
 " writing of the law of the Spirit of Life in his heart; and this will
 " be his rule, from the law of sin and death; even unto the land of
 " life.]— Now, if men have mistaken, in the night of darkness,
 " and put the scriptures out of their place, (*even in the place of the*
 " *Spirit*.) and so have become ministers, not of the Spirit but of the
 " letter, whereas the apostles were made 'able ministers of the New
 " Testament, not of the letter but of the Spirit'—2 Cor. iii. 6. Let
 " them not be offended at the Spirit of God, for teaching us otherwise,
 " nor at us for learning as the Spirit of God hath taught us; *the scrip-*
 " *tures also testifying*, that this is the rule, but no where setting up
 " themselves for the rule. And it is the same Spirit which would
 " now *fix* men in the scriptures, *to keep men from Christ* the Living
 " Rule, and only way to Life Eternal, as formerly kept them by tra-
 " ditions, from the scriptures, though it is hard for them, who are en-
 " tangled in this deceit to see it."—Pages 361, 362, 363.

From this extended quotation it is apparent, that Isaac Penning-
 ton had no design to lessen the true value of the Holy Scriptures, but
 only to draw people off, from an undue reliance upon them, *in op-*
 " *position to the Spirit*; and from exalting them into that place, which
 " the Spirit alone ought to occupy. While he contends against the
 " erroneous idea, that they are *the perfect and only rule of faith*, he as-
 " serts that they *point to the fountain*, and *bear testimony unto Christ*,
 " and that such as hear this testimony and come unto Christ, will
 " know him to be their perfect rule, and deliverance from the law of
 " sin and death.

On pages 59 and 61 respectively, we have a short extract from
 this same treatise, in which I. Pennington speaks of the Spiritual

nature of that perfect rule of faith, which is to be followed and obeyed under this gospel dispensation. The arguments which he enforces, are substantially the same, as those in the last quotation we have made.

It will be remembered, that the persons whose opinions I. Pennington was combatting, denied the sensible influences of the Holy Spirit, and contended that the scriptures were the *only means* whereby the saving knowledge of God and of Christ could be obtained. Hence they denominated them the Word of God—the key of David, and gave them other exalted epithets which Friends believed to be justly and properly applicable to Christ alone. It was in consequence of this great unwillingness among professors generally, to believe in the fundamental doctrine of internal revelation, and their placing entire dependence upon the scriptures, interpreted by their own reason, as a guide in the great work of salvation, that our ancient Friends wrote so much upon this subject, and were so unwearied in their exertions to draw professors to the divine Life and power in the soul. Their expressions, therefore, when they say they are not *the rule*, are to be understood of that general, primary, and perfect rule of faith and manners, which they considered the Holy Spirit *only* to be. In this same essay I. Pennington calls the scriptures an outward rule, and says that Paul taught nothing but Moses and the prophets—that the scriptures are the words of the Spirit, and that by exalting them into the place of the Spirit, professors miss of the true use, benefit, and intent of the scriptures.

On page 61 of the pamphlet, we have a short extract on the subject of the scriptures, taken from an essay entitled “The way of life and death made manifest, and set before men,” &c. I. Pennington’s reply to the following objection, will serve to show clearly, the views of the primitive Quakers, upon this important subject. “Objection—But are not the scriptures the word of God? And is not the word of God to be a christian’s rule? If every one should be left to his own spirit, what confusion and uncertainty would this produce?”

“Answer—The scriptures are not that Living Word, which is appointed by God, to be the rule of a christian, but they contain words, *spoken by the Spirit of God, testifying of that Word, and pointing to that Word*, which is to be the rule. ‘Search the scriptures, for in them ye think to have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me, and ye will not come to me, that ye may have life’—John v. 39, 40. The scriptures are *to be searched*, for the testimony which they give of Christ; and when that testimony is received, Christ is to be come to, and life received from him. But the Pharisees formerly, and christians since, (I mean christians in name,) search the scriptures, but *do not come to Christ for the life*, but stick in the letter of the scriptures, and *oppose the Life with the letter*, keeping themselves from the life, by their wisdom, and knowledge in the letter. Thus they put the scriptures into the place of Christ, and so honour neither Christ nor the scriptures. It had been no honour to John to have been taken for the light; his ho-

your was to point to it: nor is it any honour to the scriptures to be called the Word of God; but their honour is to *discover and testify* of the Word."—Vol. i. pages 14, 15.

He proceeds to describe the Word of God, in the language of Holy Scripture, "quick and powerful, and sharper than any two edged sword," to which he recommends the attention to be chiefly directed. He then says:

"He that hath an ear, let him hear. 'Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith: prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?' 2 Corinth. xiii. 5. Are ye in the faith? Then Christ is in you. Is not Christ in you? Then ye are in the reprobate state, out of the faith. [Is Christ in you, and shall he not hold the reins, and rule? Shall the living Word be in the heart, and not the rule of the heart? Shall he speak in the heart, and man or woman in whom he speaks, run to the words of scripture formerly spoken, to know whether these be his words or no? Nay, nay; his sheep know his voice better than so. Did the Apostle John, who had seen, and tasted, and handled, and preached, the Word of life, send Christians to his epistles, or any other part of scripture, to be their rule? Nay, he directed them to the anointing, as a sufficient teacher.] [1 John ii. 17. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. John vii. 38. He that hath the fountain of life in him, issuing out rivers of living water continually, hath he need to go forth to fetch in water?"]—Pages 16, 17.

It must be evident to every candid reader, that I. Pennington is here alluding to the impropriety of setting the sacred volume, above the revelation of the Holy Spirit of Christ in the soul; and to prove that he had no intention of derogating from the true value of the scriptures, we subjoin the following extract from the same essay.

Page 17, he says, "But to cry up these, [the scriptures,] not understanding their voice, but keeping at a distance from the thing that they invite to, the words hereby are *put out of their place*, out of their *proper use and service*, and so attain neither *their end*, nor *their glory*. And though man put that upon them, which seems to be a greater glory, namely, to make them his rule and guide; yet it being not a true glory, it is no glory, but a dishonour both to them and to the spirit, *who gave them* to another end."

Page 20, he says, "*In my heart and soul I honour the scriptures*, and long to read them throughout, with the pure eye, and in the pure light of the living spirit of God: but the Lord preserve me from reading one line of them, in my own will, or interpreting any part of them, according to my own understanding, but only as I am guided, led, and enlightened by him, in the will and understanding which comes from him. And here, *all scripture*, every writing of God's spirit, which is from the breath of his life, is *profitable* to build up and perfect the man of God; but the instructions, the reproofs, the observations, the rules, the grounds of hope and comfort, or whatever else, which man gathers out of the scriptures, (he himself being *out of the life*;) have not the true profit, nor build up the

true thing, but both the gatherings and the gatherer, are for destruction. And the Lord will ease the scripture of the burden of man's formings and inventions from it, and *recover its honour again*, by the living presence and power of *that spirit that wrote it*, and then it shall be no longer abused, and wrested by man's earthly and unlearned mind, but in the hands of the spirit, come to its true use and service, to the seed and to the world."

In a "Reply to some Animadversions," he says, "Yet, (though we do own Christ to be the rule,) we *do not deny* making use of the scriptures, to *try doctrines and forms of religion by*: but *know that what is of God, doth and will agree therewith, and what doth not agree therewith, is not of God*; and that our forefathers in the faith were led to batter the superstitions and idolatries of the papists, by the testimony of the scriptures. And we have also the testimony of the scriptures with us, both to the light and spirit within, and against forms, formerly invented or now practised, *out of the life and power*. But we believe the spirit to be a touchstone beyond the scriptures, and to be that, which giveth ability to try, and discern not only words, but spirits; whereas a man may hold the form of doctrine and godliness, and yet want the power: in which case, nothing can try such a spirit, but the spirit of God, which is in the spiritual man. And for calling the scriptures the Word of God, we cannot but look upon it as an improper expression; they being many words, not the one Word; and Christ is called in the scripture, not only the Word-God, but the Word of God. And if, in the fear of the Lord, and true sense, we keep herein to the expressions of scripture, and its form of words, *which are sound*, surely we cannot justly be blamed for so doing."—Vol. iv. pages 208, 209.

In comparing the sentiments of I. Pennington, respecting the Holy Scriptures, with those of Elias Hicks on the same subject, we are forcibly struck with the wide difference between them. I. Pennington not only says, that he loves and honours them, in his heart and soul, and that they are profitable to build up and perfect the man of God, but he declares his belief, that *they are a rule to try doctrines and forms of religion by*; that *whatsoever is of God doth and will agree therewith*; and *whatsoever doth not agree therewith is not of God*. This simple declaration is sufficient to convince any reasonable person, that Isaac Pennington and Elias Hicks are not of one religious profession; since the latter not only denies the scriptures to be a test of doctrines, but even rejects doctrines which they teach in the most solemn and positive manner.

If whatsoever does not agree with scripture is not of God, as I. Pennington unequivocally asserts; it follows, most certainly, that the notions which Elias Hicks is now promulgating, as the product of revelation, cannot be of God, nor owned by him, but are phantoms of the imagination of man, produced by the mists of error and delusion; since they do directly deny and invalidate many of the most positive and solemn declarations, which the Holy Spirit, through the inspired penmen, has recorded in the pages of the sacred volume.

At the top of page 72, of the compilers' pamphlet, we are referred

to Isaac Pennington's works, for an extract on the subject of the Trinity. It is taken from a tract, which we have had occasion several times to notice, entitled "An Examination of the grounds and causes, &c." The compilers have not presented the quotation fairly, having greatly altered the sentence, so as to obscure the author's meaning; we shall therefore insert Isaac Pennington's remarks more at length, enclosing the parts which the compilers have selected, in brackets, designated by a hand. It is his reply to the first cause, alleged for persecuting the Quakers, viz:—their denial of the Trinity.

☞["1st. Concerning the Sacred Trinity. They (the Quakers) generally, both in their speakings and in their writings, *set their seal to the truth of that Scripture*, 1 John, v. 7. That "there are Three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit. That these Three are distinct, *as three several beings, or persons*; this they read not; but in the same place, they read, that 'they are one.' And thus they believe, their being to be one, their life one, their light one, their wisdom one, their power one: and he that knoweth and seeth any one of them, knoweth and seeth them all, according to that saying of Christ's to Philip, 'He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father.'] ☞—John xiv. 9. *Three there are, and yet one*; thus they have read in the Scriptures, and this *they testify they have had truly opened to them by that very spirit*, which gave forth the Scriptures, insomuch that *they certainly know it to be true, and own the thing from their very hearts*: ☞["but as for this title of Sacred Trinity, they find it not in "Scripture;"] ☞ and they look upon Scripture words as fittest to express Scripture things by. And surely if a man *mean the same thing as the Scripture means, the same words will suffice to express it*: but the papists and school men, having missed of the thing which the Scripture drives at, and apprehended somewhat else, in the wise imagining part, have brought forth many phrases of their own invention, to express their apprehensions by, which we confess we have no unity with; but are content *with feeling the thing which the Scripture speaks of*, and with the words whereby the Scriptures express it"—Vol. i. p. 558.

We have here one of the most palpable instances of garbling, with a view *to obscure an author's meaning*, which we have yet had occasion to notice. We are aware that in quoting from any author, there must be some discretionary power used; as it could not be expected that a compiler, should *always insert* whole paragraphs or essays. When the scope of the author's meaning is strictly, and honestly preserved, no objection can arise from the brevity of the extract; but when a sentence is mutilated, a paragraph curtailed, or words interpolated, with a manifest design to change the sense, or to render it ambiguous, and thus to inculcate a doctrine which the author never held, such perversion and garbling, must ever be considered as unjust and dishonourable.

It must be remembered, that the compilers have set out, with the *professed* intention, of giving us an exposition of the doctrines and principles of primitive Friends. Let us then examine, how

fairly they have done this, in the present instance. Isaac Pennington is asserting the belief of himself and his cotemporary friends, in relation to the doctrine of the Trinity; which he declares they own, when expressed in the terms of Holy Scripture. This the compilers quote, and continue their extract through that part, where he is proving the Holy Three to be one being, &c. but there they stop, omitting an important part, where he asserts that *they are not only one, but Three, viz: "Three there are, and yet one; thus they [the Quakers] have read in the Scriptures, and this they testify, they have had truly opened to them, by that very spirit, which gave forth the Scriptures, insomuch that they certainly know it to be true, and own the thing from their very hearts."*

This surely is an important declaration of their doctrine on the point in question, and had the compilers been honestly desirous of exhibiting the principles of the early Quakers faithfully, they could not have omitted it;—especially as they resume their quotation from a colon, in order to take in that part of a sentence, where Isaac Pennington objects to the term "Sacred Trinity;" viz. "but as for this title of Sacred Trinity, they find it not in Scripture;" Here they stop at a semicolon, join the fragment to the preceding sentence, as though they were immediately connected in the treatise, and close up their quotation with a period, as if it were the termination of the sentence; whereas I. Pennington goes on to declare, that though they reject the term as unscriptural, yet they own the doctrine fully, viz: "and they look upon Scripture words, as fittest to express Scripture things by. And surely if a man mean the same thing as the Scripture means, the same words will suffice to express it." We will leave our readers to judge whether this kind of mutilation, does not betray more of a desire to *wrest* the sentiments of primitive Friends, so as to make them agree with the opinions of Elias Hicks, rather than to state them with truth and candour.

On pages 72 and 73 of the pamphlet, we have another quotation from Isaac Pennington, which, as it stands there, is scarcely intelligible. On referring to the essay from whence it is taken, we find that the author is treating upon the mysterious contents of the Revelations of John the Divine. We shall insert the paragraph at length, and enclose the parts which the compilers have extracted, in brackets, as usual, in order that the reader may decide how truly, or clearly they represent the sentiments of primitive Friends.

"Now whereas many say, that the book of the Revelations is such a mystical book, that it is not to be understood; to what end then was it written? It was the Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him to show unto his servants, things which must shortly come to pass, ch. i. 1.; and would Christ give them forth in such words as could not be understood? Again it is said verse 5th, Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein, for the time is at hand. ☞ [How can any be blessed in the reading, or how can any keep what is written therein, without understanding

“ the things contained in it? How can any follow the true Church
 “ into the wilderness; or avoid being taken with the golden cup of
 “ fornications of the false church, or refuse the mark of the beast,
 “ (that he take it neither on his forehead nor hand, nor have the
 “ name of the beast upon him, nor so much as the number of his
 “ name) unless he truly and rightly understand these warnings and
 “ descriptions of the Holy Spirit of God, given forth in the book.
 “ to preserve in the way of truth, [and] in the way of life, (though
 through great sufferings and tribulations) out of the way of spiritual
 whoredom and death? For mystical Babylon, the nations of the
 earth, and great ones (generally) commit fornication with, Rev. xvii.
 2. and xviii. 3. Indeed this book is a mystery to man’s wisdom,
 for it was not given to the wisdom of this world, but is hid from
 that; but God gave it [to] Christ, to give to his servants; and it is
 not a mystery (but opened and revealed by the Father’s Spirit) to
 the children of the true wisdom, who are instructed and taught of
 God, to escape the bed of whoredom, and spiritual fornication,
 which the earthly wisdom (in the wisest men of this world,) is en-
 tangled in.”—Vol. iv. p. 72.

It will be perceived, that by the manner in which the compilers
 have quoted from this paragraph, the meaning of I. Pennington’s re-
 marks is totally lost. No person could imagine from their extract,
 what subject he was writing upon. The compilers have adduced it
 to support the idea, that we are not to believe what we cannot un-
 derstand, as is obvious from their italicising the word *understand* in
 two places. They must, however, have been fully aware at the time,
 that they were doing the greatest violence and injustice to the sen-
 timents of I. Pennington, since he declares “ the Book” to be a mys-
 tery to man’s wisdom—incomprehensible to the reason of the wisest
 men, and only opened and revealed by the Father’s spirit. This is
 quite another thing from understanding all that we believe, since in
 this case no revelation would be necessary. So far from giving us
 the opinions of Isaac Pennington in this instance, they have closed
 their quotation at a comma, and pointed it with a period, lest the
 subject upon which I. Pennington was speaking, should be discover-
 ed, and the total irrelevance of his observations, to their purpose,
 fully set forth. We could say much upon the unrighteousness of
 such conduct, but we prefer leaving it to the honest determination of
 every upright and enlightened mind. I. Pennington was far from
 entertaining so irreligious an opinion, as that the great mysteries of
 the gospel of Christ, were to be scanned by human powers; on the
 other hand, he repeatedly declared that they were utterly incompre-
 hensible to human reason, and could only be known, as they were
 unfolded by the revelation of that Eternal Spirit, which searcheth all
 things, yea, the deep things of God.

The compilers conclude their pamphlet with an extract from an
 essay, by I. Pennington, upon the important subject of church unity.
 The sentiments it contains are well adapted to the state of brethren
 of the same family, and household of faith; those who can in sinceri-
 ty of soul, adopt the language of the primitive believers, “ Our fel-
 lowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.” Among

such only, can true unity subsist; and to these, and none others, do the excellent observations of I. Pennington apply. Those who deny the very foundation of this precious unity, viz. the union of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as our blessed Lord, in that most holy prayer, was pleased to set forth: "That they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe, that thou hast sent me;" such can have no claim to the privileges of that happy state.

I. Pennington says in the extract, that harsh interpretations, concerning any thing relating to one another, is unworthy to be found in an Israelite toward an Egyptian; but exceeding shameful and inexcusable to be found in one brother toward another. Harsh *interpretations* we entirely disapprove: but when actions speak in a language so plain and positive, as to require *no interpretation*, it surely cannot be a breach of christian charity to designate them by the name which they give themselves. When our friends err through inadvertency, it is our duty ever to view their failings in the most favourable light that a conscientious regard to truth will admit of; but when those errors become notorious, and are obstinately persisted in, it is incumbent upon us, to speak the truth without hypocrisy. We are not, however, to suppose that one who might be called an Egyptian, is to be placed on an equality with false brethren. No. Those who have swerved from the ancient faith of the gospel, and, while professing the name of Jesus Christ, are denying his divinity and atonement, and secretly and assiduously striving to annul the only sure bond of religious communion, and to draw the unwary from their steadfastness in Christ; such, are more to be avoided than open unbelievers. They can have no valid claim to the appellation of brethren, however they may assume the outward appearance, and seek to pass themselves as members of the true church.

The author of the essay exclaims, "How many weaknesses doth the Lord pass by in us!" and we reverently adopt the grateful language, for his mercy indeed endureth forever. But is this to be made a screen and an excuse for principles and practices subversive of the holiest doctrines and precepts of the gospel of Christ? Then Christ may have fellowship with Belial, and light hold communion with darkness.

I. Pennington says, where there is any evil manifest, wait, Oh wait, to overcome it with good! This is peculiarly proper and becoming, as relates to personal injuries or offences. But it is not to deter the sincere christian from earnestly contending for that holy faith once delivered to the saints. He is not to set down in careless indifference, and suffer the most pernicious and destructive doctrines to be disseminated, without animadversion or opposition. This would be nothing short of betraying his Lord and Master; nothing less than denying *Him*, before men. Such supineness would, doubtless, be viewed with great complacency, by those whose ambitious desires, and towering pride, prompt them to resort to every stratagem to promote their own views, and to gain partisans to their cause.— These, have ever been the first to raise the cry of persecution against those who were honestly engaged to support the law and the testi-

mony, and who dare not forsake the cause of Jesus Christ. They have stigmatized these as spiritual inquisitors; opposed the wholesome order of the church, as tyranny and oppression; and pretended great concern that liberty of conscience might be preserved, while, in truth, they are too often actuated by no better motive, than the desire to gain popularity and power, and elevate themselves into stations where they may lord it over the heritage of God.

I. Pennington, who knew well the subtle workings of this deceitful spirit, was far from intending to afford any shelter to its advocates, as he solemnly testified against them, in several of his writings. In his reply to some misrepresentations of John Pennyman, who endeavoured to show, that I. Pennington disapproved of church government, we find the following pertinent remarks.—After declaring that all worldly ambition, and wisdom, and power, is to be excluded from the true church, and the Lord's power alone to be exalted, he says—

“But doth all this hinder, deny, or oppose Christ's spirit, Christ's power, Christ's truth and grace, from arising in the church, in a way of spiritual and holy government? Because man is not to aspire, nor take upon him, to reign or rule because of grace, gifts, or knowledge received; shall not therefore the head govern the body? Shall not life and truth, and the wisdom of God, spring in the church, to order and govern the church? But must every man be left to the dictates of what *he calls*, light in him, and not to be reprov'd or testified against, though the spirit of God manifest it (to them that are indeed in the light, life, spirit, and power,) that *it is not light*, as persons may *pretend* and *imagine*, but *real darkness, gross darkness, darkness that may be felt*, even by the least babes that are in the true, living sense?”—Vol. iv. page 383.

Again, in the same essay:

“But if the Lord hath taught a man, opened the same eye in him, that he opened in others, and brought into *unity and uniformity* with the church, in the practices which the Lord hath taught it; and he afterwards *let in another spirit*, and fall from these practices, and *judge the very church itself for continuing in them*; may not the church testify to this person, that he is erred from his guide, hath lost the light in himself and so judgeth amiss, both concerning himself and concerning the church of God? This hath been the state of some who went out from among us formerly, and may also be the state of some who *go out from us now*. For as there is one that gathers to the true church, so there is *another* that endeavours to *draw and scatter from it, and then, to cause men to turn head against it*, as if it were not of God, but apostatised from the spirit and principle of truth, which *indeed is their own state and condition*, in God's sight, but *not the church's*, which was gathered and preserved by him, glory to the Lord, over all the accusations of the accuser *through what mouth soever he uttered them forth*.”—Vol. iv. page 90.

After speaking of the great value of liberty of conscience, he says:

“Concerning what conscience is this to be understood? Is it to

be understood of the tender and weak conscience? Or of the *hard* and *seared* conscience? For the conscience which God once made tender, may afterwards come to be seared and hardened. And is the church of Christ, which is guided by the spirit and wisdom of God, taught and required by him, so to act toward the hard and seared conscience, as it is toward the tender and weak conscience? Is the hard and seared conscience, which hath forsaken the true light, spirit, and power, and *turned against the truth*, and is in a wrong, stiff, wilful, hardened liberty, and subtilty, to be left to its liberty, and to that spirit which draweth it out, and hardeneth it in a wrong liberty? Can there be *any unity*, in the light and in the spirit, had with those who are erred from the light and from the spirit, and are deceived in their own hearts concerning it, and do but only pretend to it? Can they walk sweetly and harmoniously together in differing practices, who *differ also in the ground*, and are not one in the foundation, even in the true light and spirit of the Lord? Ought not the church to judge this spirit, with its liberty and evil conscience, (for that spirit will make the consciences of all that let it in, evil,) as well as, to the utmost, to cherish the liberty of the tender consciences, in and to the Lord? Read and consider these scriptures following, Tit. i. 15. 1 Tim. i. 19, iv. 2."—pages 395, 396.

In some considerations on church government which he added to the former essay, he makes the following objection, viz :

"Objection.—But have I not been taught to be subject to the light in my own heart, and to make that my judge? And is not this another, or new, or different doctrine from that,—now to tell me I must subject to the light of God's spirit in his church? Suppose that which the church requires, or orders, or holds forth, be different from my light, or be not yet revealed to me by the light wherewith God hath enlightened me, must I deny the light wherewith God hath enlightened me, and subject to the church's light? Or must I practice as the church orders, before I have light and faith in my own particular?"

To this objection he replies in several paragraphs, the fifth of which we quote.

"Great sobriety is needful in such cases, wherein men are too prone to be judging others, especially the church of God. Every man is to take heed of thinking of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man, the measure of faith, Rom. xii. 3. And the young men who have not the experience of the aged, and are most apt to confidence and excursions, are in a special manner to be exhorted to be sober minded, Tit. ii. 6. Men may easily judge that others err, and that they themselves keep to the light and measure of truth in their own particulars, but it is hard to do it. But they that *indeed* do it, *abide in the humility* and innocency and lamb-like spirit, which would give no offence in any thing, neither to Jew nor Gentile, ~~nor~~ to the church of God. If it will go so hard with him that offends one of Christ's little ones, how will it go with *him that offends His church*, wherein his power and glory riseth, and is established? *The church is not apt to be such an erring body*, from the light, spirit, and power of

the Lord Jesus, as *many* who *mistake* concerning the light in their own particulars, are too apt to suppose."—Vol. iv. page 413.

Among the many authors, with which the early history of the Society of Friends, has made us acquainted, there are few to be found, whose controversial writings evince a more meek and heavenly temper, or whose doctrines are more pure, evangelical and scriptural, than I. Pennington's. He had largely tasted and handled of the good word of life, had learned his religion in the school of Jesus Christ, and was taught by experience, the preciousness of those glorious doctrines which are so clearly set forth in the sacred volume. Amidst all calumnies of envious accusers, the treachery of false brethren, and the storms of cruel persecution which fell to the lot of this good man, he evinced the most lamb-like patience and resignation, the most christian forbearance and good will toward all; yet as one whose hope and confidence was immoveably fixed upon Christ Jesus, the Rock of ages, he forsook not the faith, he swerved not from those precious truths which he had learned through suffering, but nobly vindicated himself and his brethren from the charge of denying them.

His writings are richly replete with christian instruction; and those who will peruse them attentively, will find that in all the fundamental principles of the gospel of Christ, he is remarkably sound, clear, and scriptural. It is, therefore, ungenerous in the compilers of the pamphlet, to adduce his name at the present day, as authority for sentiments which are directly subversive of the whole tenor of his writings, which contravene those tenets which he strenuously contended for, and in support of which, he endured the loss of much of his temporal estate, and many long and painful imprisonments.

CHAPTER V.

Observations on the extracts made by the Compilers of the Pamphlet from the works of GEORGE WHITEHEAD.

THE first quotation which we are presented with, from the works of this distinguished member of the Society of Friends, is taken from the second part of the "Christian Quaker." The chapter in which it is found, treats of "Justification and Imputation," the question under discussion, being, "Whether impure, that is, unsanctified persons, while such, be justified by the imputation of Christ's righteousness?" George Whitehead thus objects to his opponent's doctrine :

"You have lived in *sin and disobedience all your life long*, and have preached to others, that perfect freedom from sin and corruption, is not attainable, in this life, by any, either in the beginning or end of life, but have preached many into more looseness and liberty of sinning, by telling them that it is God's good pleasure not to remove the being of sin in this life, but to suffer corruptions to remain in his saints, to keep them humble; so *no part of your life is pure or clean, but corrupt and sinful*; what have you to plead or say for yourselves, why sentence of damnation should not pass upon you?" His opponent pleads in reply—

"Christ's holy life and suffering is our *only* defence or apology, against this charge. *Though I am guilty*, yet satisfaction hath been made for that guilt; because, therefore, the same fault cannot be twice punished, after satisfaction, 'tis as if it never were: this is the *only* way of defence we have at God's tribunal. Christ's sufferings are they, for which God will justify us—they have *fully* satisfied justice for our sins; we may be *confident*, they will secure us from condemnation, it being against justice to punish those sinners a second time, that *have been punished to the full already*."

The nature of the question, will, we apprehend, be fully understood by our readers, after the foregoing statement. The extract given by the compilers, is taken from George Whitehead's rejoinder to the answer of his opponent; and to make his meaning more clear, we shall take in the whole of the paragraph. The part which the compilers have selected, is enclosed in brackets, designated by a hand.

"To all which, it may be justly replied, and reflected upon you, who are thus pleading and making your apology, *in your sins and unholy life*, this will not cover nor excuse you *in your sins*, if you *live and die in sin*, your mouths will be stopped, you will not be *able to plead* Christ's holy life and sufferings, to rescue you from condemnation; *except you repent*, ye shall all likewise perish: what in-

fluence or effect hath Christ's holy life or sufferings upon you, only you profess and plead them? So it may be said, Christ was ever holy, but you were *never* holy; Christ was a *sacrifice* of a sweet smelling savour to God, which neither your life nor actions seem any thing of, but contrariwise, are a bad savour to him. Christ was an holy and perfect example, which you *never* followed, nor ever *intend* to follow, so long as you live, (for you do not believe it is attainable;) Christ came to condemn sin in the flesh, which you *keep alive* (and plead for,) in your flesh as long as you live: Christ also came to fulfil the righteousness of the law in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit: but you do *not own* nor *believe* its fulfilling to be in your persons, but only in Christ's person: *Christ's blood was not only for remission of sins past*, but is to cleanse from all sin, and to purge the conscience, sanctify, &c. This you reject, and in your sins, and defiled consciences trample the blood of the covenant under foot, and add to the sufferings of Christ, and the sin of his persecutors, by adding sin unto sin, and so grieving his spirit all your days, and pleading his holy life for your defence therein; and so the guilt of his blood will be charged upon you, in the day of judgment, if you repent not. And further, [you blasphemously charge divine justice with punishing your sins to the full, in Christ, or punishing him that was ever innocent, to the full, for your sins; so that you account it against justice to punish your sins again in you, though you live and die in them. And yet you think it an excellent piece of justice to punish the innocent to the full, for the guilty. But your mistake herein is gross, as will further appear, and you will not be acquitted nor cleared hereby. This will not prove you, invested with Christ's everlasting righteousness, nor will this cover your own filthy rags, or hide your shame.

“And while you think that you are secured in your sins, from the stroke of justice, as having been fully executed, and that, by way of revenge, upon the innocent Son of God, in punishing your sins to the full upon him; I say, while you state this as the nature of the satisfaction by Christ's suffering in your stead, the whole world may as well acquit itself thereby from punishment as you: for he died for all, and is ‘the propitiation for the sins of the whole world.’ And, therefore, if this must be looked upon, as the full punishment of sin, laid upon Christ, and that ‘the sin cannot be twice punished after such satisfaction,’ this may make a merry world in sin; once punished to the full in Christ, never to be punished again upon the offender, which the law directly takes hold of. Oh, sinners’ soothing doctrine! the plain effect of which is, to make the wicked world rejoice in a sinful state, and say, Oh! admirable justice, that was pleased thus to revenge thyself upon an innocent man, that never sinned, and to punish our sin to the full upon him! Oh! transcendent mercy! that hast found out this expedient that we might be fully acquitted, pardoned, and discharged from the penalty, that is just and due to us, for all our sins, past, present, and to come. Oh! what glad tidings are these to the hypocrites and drunkards,] &c. And how merry they are apt to be in their sins, upon their ministers proclaiming such an act of indemnity of all of

fences and injuries past, present, and to come, not only against their neighbours, but against God himself. But if it be objected, that without sound faith, (which is a working faith) men have not an interest in Christ's obedience, righteousness, or satisfaction, nor are we invested with any thing for which God should pronounce us righteous, &c.

“ From hence it follows then, that if they remain in unbelief, they have no interest in Christ's righteousness or satisfaction ; and then the consequence is, Christ did not make satisfaction in our stead, nor was punished, for the sin of unbelief, nor for the effects of unbelief, to acquit us therein ; for what sins then, was he punished to the full ?”—1st Edit. p. 195, 196.

From the quotation we have given, it will appear that George Whitehead was *only* contending against the vulgar, and now generally abandoned, doctrine of justifying sinners in their iniquities, and thereby tolerating every species of wickedness.—Such a doctrine as made people think they could get to heaven while laden with crimes, under the delusive notion that another had been punished to the full in their stead. But while George Whitehead thus opposes this sin pleasing idea, he is careful *fully to acknowledge*, his belief in the *atonement of Christ*, confessing that *his blood was not only shed for remission of sins, but also inwardly sprinkled, to purge and purify the conscience: that he died for all, and is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world.*—This is fully consonant with Scripture.

The great contradiction between George Whitehead and Elias Hicks, is strikingly apparent.—For it is not the former sin-pleasing doctrine merely, which Elias Hicks denies, but also the sacrifice, and propitiation of our blessed Lord, which George Whitehead is so careful to distinguish from the other, and to assert his firm belief in,—this Scripture doctrine it is, that Elias Hicks calls wicked and absurd, an outrage against every righteous law of God and man. In vain then, do the compilers adduce this passage to show that the Christian belief of that worthy man, corresponded with the dogmas of Elias Hicks. Their own quotation proves in the clearest and most unequivocal manner, that they are at variance, and that the latter has really swerved, from the ancient and evangelical faith of the founders of this Society.

The next page of the pamphlet, presents us with a short quotation from the second part of the *Christian Quaker*, by G. Whitehead, in these words : “ If all had walked in his light within, he (Christ) had not been persecuted and murdered.” These words are taken out of the middle of a long paragraph, beginning after a semicolon, and ending at a semicolon ; in which disjointed position they present a meaning, which, though strictly true in itself, is quite different from that, intended by the author. We shall quote the whole paragraph, to render his argument clear, and as usual, insert the extracts of the compilers in brackets, marked with a hand. He is replying to Thomas Hicks' reasoning against the influence of the Holy Spirit, whose third argument is—

“ If the light within be sufficient to save men, then it renders

Christ's coming and suffering, needless." To which G. Whitehead answers—

"This is a blind inference; still *opposing* the light of Christ within, (yea, and all that is of God in man,) as *insufficient*, and so as neither discovering Christ's coming, nor the effect of his suffering; or as if men might be saved by his coming and suffering, *without* respect to his light within, which shows gross darkness, as if there *were not a concurrence* between the light within, and the end of Christ's coming and suffering; and he might as well say, that if the *engrafted Word which is within*, be able to save the soul, then Christ's coming and suffering was needless; he should rather have said that *Christ's coming and suffering without*, was because men were *turned from* his light within; for [if all had walked in his "light within, he had not been persecuted and murdered;] but this man's argument, supposeth Christ's coming and suffering to be for the *supply of some great defect or insufficiency*, of his light within; as if man had so *well improved it*, and *found it too scanty or insufficient*; and, therefore, by this, Christ must suffer and die, for his own light within, to supply it; whereas *Christ died for the ungodly, for all men that were dead in sin*, who had disobeyed and transgressed his light within; and though there *be a reconciliation by his death*, yet the being *saved* is by his life, whose life is the light of men, which for men to be turned to, in themselves, and therein to live to God, *varies not from the blessed end of Christ's coming and suffering*, while he works in man, by his light and power within, both in showing him sin, and saving him from it, as he believes in the light, becomes a child of the light thereof, as Christ exhorted: and if we walk in the light of God, the *blood of Jesus Christ his Son, cleanseth us from all sin.*"—Pages 16, 17.

From the manner in which the compilers have garbled their quotation, and the italicising of some words, it is readily seen that they design to make it convey the idea, that Christ's offering himself up a sacrifice for sin, was a mere adventitious circumstance, not necessarily connected with the plan of Christian redemption. Now that this is not the meaning of George Whitehead, is evident from the context. He contends, that the Light or Spirit of God was all-sufficient for salvation from the beginning, and that had all men walked in obedience to it, *from Adam to the present time*; then Christ would not have been persecuted and murdered. But men having rebelled, and turned away from the light within; that rebellion and disobedience to the light, rendered Christ's coming and suffering in the flesh necessary, to restore them to the state from which they have fallen; which is the obvious meaning of his words, when he says, "he should rather have said, that *Christ's coming and suffering without, was because* men were turned from the light within; for had *all* walked in his light within, he had not been persecuted and murdered:" the whole of which results in this, that if man had not fallen, there would not have been occasion for the outward manifestation of the Son of God in the flesh. The extract we have given, contains a very full confession of faith, in the propitiatory sacrifice and atonement, made by our blessed Lord, for a

ungodly and wicked world; which is in contradiction to the notion of Elias Hicks, that he was not an atonement for any sin, but the legal sins of the Jews. George Whitehead says, there is a concurrence between the outward offering and the work within, and that our being saved by the life of Christ, varies not from the blessed end of Christ's coming and suffering in the flesh, for if we walk in the Light of God, the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.

Immediately following the last, we have another quotation from the same work, upon the subject of Satisfaction, in which we think the compilers have done great injustice to George Whitehead; by mutilating the sentence, so as to obscure and conceal the doctrine which he was asserting, in opposition to that of a full, rigid, and complete satisfaction for sin. We shall state the controversy in his own language, and enclose the parts quoted by the compilers, in brackets: of his opponent, Henry Grigg, he says—

“He is very inconsistent, in his saying, “that redemption and justification, have been *fully completed*, and *finished* by our Lord Jesus for us, once for all; and that *the debt is paid*, and *satisfaction made*,” while yet he grants that “ignorance and unbelief, as chains and fetters, bind many in Satan's kingdom;” for did you ever know of any, so fully in a *redeemed* and *justified* estate, while so actually under Satan's chains and fetters in his kingdom? Or that any should be thus detained in prison, so long after the debt is paid, and satisfaction made, as he imagines: [“But in this notion of “satisfaction, he appears very short and shallow, though it be not “a Scripture phrase, as T. Danson grants; and though it depends, “but upon some notions of law, as Dr. Owen saith. Now that all “men's debt should be so *strictly paid*, or such a *severe satisfaction* “made to *vindicate* justice, by Christ in their stead; (*which* God “never imposed upon the son of his love) and that for sins past, “present, and to come, (as some say) how inconsistent is it?”] Besides the gross liberty this gives to sin, how agrees it, with his teaching them to pray, forgive us our debts, Matt. vi. 12.; for what needed *that*, if they *be all so strictly paid* in their stead? Howbeit, *that* Christ in another, or more acceptable sense, *was a most satisfactory offering, and sacrifice for mankind, for a sweet smelling savour to God*, Ephes. v. 2. *This we confess and own; and that he tasted death, not only for some, but for every man; and is a propitiation for the sins of the whole world.*”—p. 89, 90.

It will appear from this extended quotation, which includes no more than the same paragraph, from which the compilers have taken their extract; that they have greatly misrepresented G. Whitehead, by omitting his statement of the “notion of satisfaction,” as held by his opponent; and the conclusion of the paragraph, in which he asserts, that though he denies their vulgar notion of rigid satisfaction, yet he and his fellow professors, the Quakers, do own and confess that Christ was “a most satisfactory offering and sacrifice for mankind,” “and that he tasted death, not for some only, but for every man, and is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world.”

This doctrine, which George Whitehead says the Quakers confess and own, is the very same that Elias Hicks has stigmatised with the most opprobrious epithets in his letter to Dr. Shoemaker. He calls the believers in it, idle and ignorant, bold and daring; and the doctrine itself wicked and absurd.

Let the reader now "judge impartially upon comparison, whether Elias Hicks does" not "hold and propagate doctrines and opinions contrary to the doctrines and opinions of primitive Friends." Nay, whether he has not sufficiently declared that "those who have always been acknowledged to be among the best and most approved authors of the society," are destitute of "any right sense of justice or mercy," "standing in direct opposition to every principle of justice and honesty, of mercy and love," and are "poor selfish creatures and unworthy of notice." This he declares to be the condition of all those who acknowledge a willingness to accept the forgiveness of their sins, or the hope of salvation, upon those terms which the early Quakers, with unfeigned gratitude, most reverently embraced; and yet after this positive denunciation against them, the compilers of the pamphlet, can coolly and unblushingly tell us in their preface, that Elias Hicks is now only reviving the same views and belief as they propagated.


On page 33 we have two quotations from George Whitehead's "Light and Life of Christ within, &c." In the first of these the beginning of the paragraph is omitted, which contains a very clear and full acknowledgment of the author's belief in the manhood and miraculous conception of our blessed Lord. We shall insert the whole, enclosing, as usual, the compilers' extracts in brackets. George Whitehead states the following objection, alleged against the Quakers by William Burnet, viz.

"Baptist. They do deny that man Christ, or that God-Man, that was born in Bethlehem, of the Virgin Mary."

George Whitehead answers, "We *never denied* the man Christ, nor that he took upon him flesh, or was born of the Virgin, according to the flesh, nor *did we ever deny Christ to be the Saviour*; but as for those expressions, 'God-Man, being born of Mary,' we do not find them in the scriptures, nor do we read that Mary was the mother of God, but in the Pope's canons, articles, &c. Though William Burnet has pretended the Scripture to be his rule, as if he would be exact in squaring his work thereby; here his work is contrary to his rule. Again he says, [Christ was seen with a carnal eye, and his voice heard with a carnal ear.] Whereas Christ said, He that seeth me, seeth my Father also. Now dare he say, that God is such a visible object as may be seen by a carnal eye? Surely nothing is obvious to the carnal eye, but that which is carnal or outward: but so is not the invisible. But indeed if the body that Christ took upon him in the Virgin, and which was afterwards crucified and put to death, was God, (for he tells of God-man, being born of the Virgin,) then this would make God visible and to die, when that body was put to death; which were no less than blasphemy, where as God was manifest in flesh. Christ came in the flesh. 1 Tim.

“iii. 1 John iv. and so did bear the name Christ as he was in the “flesh.”]—Page 35.

We know not with what view this extract has been presented by the compilers, unless it be to support Elias Hicks in his denial that Jesus is the Christ; because George Whitehead has said, that Christ, *in that sense* in which he was one with the Father was not, neither could be, seen with human eyes. The whole of his answer, as we have quoted it, is a most clear and full acknowledgment of the belief of the early Quakers, in the miraculous conception, Manhood and Godhead, the sufferings and death of the Lord Jesus Christ. The author declares they never denied the *man* Christ, as he took flesh of the virgin, nor yet that Christ was the Saviour; but believed that he was God manifest in the flesh, and as such was truly and properly the Christ. This is different from making him a mere man, endued with only a portion of the spirit, commensurate with the work which he had to perform, and brought into the world in the same way and for the same purpose that all other men are;—and that instead of being the Saviour, he himself had need to be saved by the same power, that all men are saved by. Such are the sentiments of Elias Hicks! how great is the contrast.



The next extract is in reply to the following objection, viz:  “*Baptist*.—He was that day born a Saviour: but had the light “within been the Saviour, or the Spirit, or the Godhead, then this “had not been that day born.

“Answer.—Hereby has he denied the spirit, the light within, “or the Godhead to be the Saviour, and so has gone about to make a “separation between Christ, the Spirit, the Light, and Godhead: “Whence then came this Christ? And by whose power was he a “Saviour? Had he any power but what was given him of the Fa- “ther? But a Saviour was born: what was he born for but to bear “witness to the Truth? And by whose power and spirit but by the “power and spirit of the Father? and what he did and wrought, it “was what God did by him. And though that day was born, in “the city of David, a Saviour, was he a Saviour distinct from ei- “ther Light within, Spirit, or Godhead? What manner of Saviour “was he then? This is sad doctrine to exclude Spirit, Light within “and Godhead from being a Saviour; surely flesh and darkness is “not the Saviour, but the Holy thing, (spoken of,) which was of the “Holy Ghost.”]—Page 46, 47.

This and the subsequent quotation which the compilers have given, are of the same import, being designed only to show the great absurdity of William Burnet's doctrine, that the body of Christ *alone*, without the Godhead which dwelt in fulness in him, was the Saviour. The reply of George Whitehead to this absurd notion of his opponents, shows clearly how firm a believer he was in the divinity of our blessed Lord, and how greatly he objected to separating what God himself had joined together, viz: The divinity and humanity of the Son of God. We need not point out how different this is from the dogmas of Elias Hicks, since it must be plain to all who are acquainted with the principles of the latter.

On page 36, of the pamphlet, we have another quotation from the

same essay, the first part of which, is merely an expose of various contradictory statements, made by William Burnet, relative to the vulgar doctrine of satisfaction, as we have before stated it. The second part is George Whitehead's reply, to the accusation of his opponents, that the Quakers asserting "the blood which sprinkles the conscience, cleanseth from sin, sanctifieth, &c., is the Life or is of the spirit, and that it is the blood of the covenant," is "gross mistake," "mere fable," &c.

To which G. Whitehead rejoins— ["Here is no mistake, nor "fables proved against us, for the Spirit, the water, and the blood, "agree in one, and by walking in the light, is the blood of Christ "known to cleanse from all sin. Now the blood that sprinkles the "conscience, cleanseth, &c. is as truly spiritual as the water is, "which Christ giveth, and by which he washeth his church through "the Word. For we are not to suppose two kinds of Saviours and "Sanctifiers, that is, both a natural (which is not in being, as is said of "the blood that was shed,) and the Spirit which still liveth. And "though Christ, that he *might sanctify the people with his own blood,* "suffered without the gates—Heb. xiii. I hope it will not be denied but "this work of sanctification is wrought and fulfilled within by the "Spirit, and that sprinkling and purging the conscience is inward; "and then where the blood is said to do it, that must needs be spi- "ritual; for surely the blood shed outwardly, must needs have a "spiritual signification as well as the water and the cross had: and "the apostle attributes washing or sanctifying, to water as well as "blood.]  Again, it is confessed, that God by his own blood purchased to himself a church—Acts xx. 28. Now the blood of God, or that blood that relates to God, must needs be spiritual, he being a spirit; and the covenant of God is inward and spiritual, and so is the blood of it. But our opposer confesses 'he is as ignorant of any such blood as may be.' And indeed so he is like to be, while he sets himself to contend against the *very mystery* of God, and against plain scripture; telling us that 'God hath not blood' contrary to Acts xx. 28—Zech. ix. 11."—p. 48, 49.

The object of George Whitehead in the reply which we have quoted, appears to be to assert the doctrine, that the work of sanctification, redemption, sprinkling the conscience, &c. is an inward work, and that the atoning and cleansing virtue of the blood of Christ is only known, when applied by the Holy Spirit to the soul. But while doing this, he is careful not to do away the outward offering; acknowledging that Christ Jesus suffered *without the gates of Jerusalem*, that he might sanctify his church with his own blood. Here is no denial of the propitiation of Jesus Christ, but a full confession to its blessed efficacy and virtue.

On the same page of the pamphlet, we have another quotation from the same work, which the compilers have mutilated, by stopping at a comma; in order to suppress the author's declaration of his faith in the atoning sacrifice of our blessed Lord. We shall quote the whole; and request our readers to notice how unfairly they deal with George Whitehead. If as they tell us, their "extracts have been carefully transcribed and compared." we think

their principal *care* has been, to *suppress* and conceal every thing which would oppose the notions of Elias Hicks; to wrest the author's language in such manner as to make it bear the strongest resemblance to his dogmas, without regard to the sense of the writers or the principles and doctrines which they held. The parts extracted by the compilers are enclosed in brackets marked with a hand.

The Baptist objects—"Now the Quakers would be so far from directing men to go to the material temple, that they make it but a vain thing, to look to *Jerusalem*, to the antitype of that temple, viz: to Jesus Christ, as he was there crucified; or to that blood that was there shed for justification.

"Answer—[The Quakers see no need of directing men to "the type for the antitype, viz: neither to the outward temple, nor yet "to *Jerusalem*, either to Jesus Christ or his blood; knowing that neither the righteousness of faith nor the word of it, doth so direct—"Romans x. And is it the Baptist's doctrine to direct men to the "material temple, and *Jerusalem*, the type for the antitype? What "nonsense and darkness is this! And where do the scriptures say, "the blood was there shed for justification, and that men must be directed to *Jerusalem* to it? (whereas that blood shed is not in being, page 40, [says the Baptists,]) but the true apostle directed "them to the Light, (which is so much opposed by the Baptist,) to "walk in the light for the blood of Jesus Christ to cleanse them from "all sin,]—1st John i. and he died for our sins, but rose again for our justification, which resurrection surely was after the shedding of the blood outwardly."

In order to understand the object of George Whitehead in this reply, it is only necessary to recur to the opinion which he is opposing, as they are stated in the Baptist's objection to the Quakers. It is, the necessity of directing men to look to Jerusalem, to be justified by that blood which was shed there. G. Whitehead in his reply, endeavours to show that there is no necessity for directing men to Jerusalem, to look for Christ there, but to recommend them to seek after an acquaintance with him by the revelation of the Spirit; and instead of looking to Jerusalem for the blood, to wait to know the Holy Spirit, to apply its pardoning virtue to the soul and conscience, which he enforces where he recommends them to walk in the Light that they may know the blood of Jesus Christ to cleanse them from all sin.

In the same book from which the compilers have quoted these passages, we find a number of accusations against Friends, made by William Burnet; to which G. Whitehead replies. Some of these, may well apply to the case in hand, and serve to show that the early Quakers did not hold the sentiments which the compilers would have us think they did. G. Whitehead says:—

"It is false that 'the Quakers slight the scriptures'—

"It is false that 'the Quakers' Christ is not God's Christ, or that they deny the Man Christ, or the Christ that is in the heavens.'

"A slander also, 'that we trample under foot the blood of the covenant, and make the offering of the Cross, a mere fiction of the

brain ;' *for we have a reverent esteem of both.* Also we do not deny the resurrection, as falsely we are accused."—Pages 8, 9.

As William Burnet, having charged the Society with owning only an imaginary God, Christ, and Spirit, George Whitehead replies :

"That God, Christ, and Spirit, the Quakers own is no other but the true God and Christ, even that God that cannot be confined, circumscribed, nor limited to a place of residence, seeing the heaven of heavens cannot contain him ; and that Christ, which ascended up far above all heavens that he might fill all things, who is God over all, blessed forever"—Page 35.

The next quotation from George Whitehead, is taken from his Christian Quaker. The compilers have not stated it in the language of the original. Henry Grigg, against whom George Whitehead is writing, asserted that "the spirit or blessed comforter cannot be the Saviour;" which George Whitehead proved to be contradictory to another assertion of his, viz :

"Till the coming of his spirit and grace with power, in my heart, for the binding of the strong man, satan, and killing my corruptions, my soul was not brought out of the horrible pit ; having wrought this glorious work of regeneration, &c." Henry Grigg denied that there was any contradiction between these two assertions of his, to which George Whitehead, rejoins :

"The contradiction is very obvious, to say the spirit cannot be the Saviour, when it can save the soul out of the horrible pit ; can it save and not be a Saviour ? Or can it bind the strong man, or kill man's corruptions, and yet not save him ? And if the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit be God, cannot God be the Saviour ? When as Christ's being the author of faith, giving power to others, to become the sons of God, is a proof of his being God. And Christ said, the Son can do nothing of himself, &c., the Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the works, John v. 19, 30. viii. 28. xiv. 10. And the Holy Spirit, where received, also maketh intercession according to the will of God, and by this spirit, Christ prayed unto the Father ; but to say the spirit, or blessed comforter, cannot be the Saviour, is also to deny Christ, in his spiritual appearance, to be a Saviour, and so confine the saving work to him, only as man, or in the flesh, without, (or separate from,) us, whereas he said, I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you, John xiv. 18, which plainly denotes *him* to be the comforter, in that spiritual appearance, wherein *he that was with them*, promised to be *in them* ; and as revealed in them, his appearance was another or diverse to his outward appearance in the flesh. Whereas Henry Grigg saith, "Are there not Three that bear record in Heaven ? I say yes ;—[and "these Three are One ; and is not Christ, (the Saviour,) that Word, "which is One of the Three, which are but one divine being, thing "or substance, though revealed under several considerations and di-
"versities of manifestations and degrees of discoveries ? Yet all
"one divine Life and Being ; as God is the Word, the Life, the
"Light, and so is Christ ;]—[and the Holy Spirit, is Life to the
righteous, and so is Christ the Way, the Truth, and the Life : In
him was Life and the Life the Light of men ; the Life affordeth

Light to all, and the Light, Life to all that obey it, and in it follow Christ, such receive the Light of Life and come to walk in the Light of the living; as the Light of Life is received unto justification and peace, the Holy Spirit is received in that glorious ministration as comforter, after a state of desolation and sorrow, of whom Christ said, He shall receive of mine and show it unto you, John xvi. 13” —Pages 127, 128, 129.

We have marked the extract of the compilers, by enclosing it in brackets with a hand. They begin with saying, “There are Three that bear record in Heaven;” but this form of expression is not found in the original, though the substance is the same. George Whitehead has it—“Whereas Henry Grigg saith, ‘Are there not Three that bear record in Heaven?’ I say, yes—and these Three are one,” &c. So it is evident that the compilers have changed George Whitehead’s language, though the sense is still preserved. We thought it proper to give the whole quotation at length, in order that the reader may observe that it contains a full acknowledgment of the scripture doctrine of the Trinity, as set forth in the seventh verse of the fifth chapter of John’s first Epistle. That there are Three and yet One.

Henry Grigg having taken exception to some of the writers among the Quakers, calling the body of Christ, his garment, asks this question, “If that body that was nailed to the cross, was but as a garment, which the true Christ did wear, or as a house in which he did dwell; why may not any other man in whose flesh Christ is manifested, and doth dwell, be called the Christ, as well as Jesus of Nazareth?”

George Whitehead answers—“There’s not the same reason for any other man to be called the Christ.

“First.—Because of his divine pre-existence, both before he took upon him that body or flesh, and before man or other things were made, *which God created by Jesus Christ.*

“Secondly.—Because of his miraculous conception, as concerning that body.

“Thirdly.—Because he was anointed with the oil of gladness *above* his fellows.

Lastly.—He that compared that body or flesh, which He took upon him, to a garment or house, intended no detraction from the honour or dignity of the true Christ; for his flesh was called the veil; *his* body, the body of Jesus; this temple, the form of a servant; and his saints are his members.”—Pages 154, 155.

S. Scandret, wrote a book against George Whitehead, in which he states the following argument—“No righteousness wrought by us, is of that worth, as to redeem our lost souls, nor for that are we justified, therefore, the sufferings of Christ only, &c.—This argument, (says he,) God enabled me, the first dispute, to press with full enlargement on the consciences of the people, to secure them from the soul-destroying error of this man, [G. W.]” To which George Whitehead replies.

“This accusation upon me, is both groundless, false, and malicious—for, First,—I never affirmed any such doctrine, as that any

righteousness wrought by the creature, doth redeem man's lost soul to God; nor place any such infinite worth, price or merit, upon any temporal act or work of man; but Christ Jesus, who is God's righteousness, is the Redeemer, Deliverer, and so the Redemption of the soul to God, by whom also the soul is enabled to true obedience. It is by grace *in him*, through faith, that we are saved, *not of ourselves*, it is the gift of God; *nor of works*, lest any man should boast; howbeit, good works, are ordained of God that we should walk in them; for we are his workmanship, created *in Christ* again unto good works. See Eph. ii. 8, 9, 10.

"Secondly—*I never undervalued the worth of Christ's sufferings in the flesh; far be it from me so to do; though yet, I cannot own this man's, [S. S.] placing men's absolute justification on them, and from thence shutting out Christ's inward work of sanctification: yet thereto, both the travail of his soul, intercession, sufferings, and sacrifice, had a lively tendency, seeing that both remission and sanctification is known through faith in his blood, which both purgeth the conscience, sanctifieth, and justifieth. I do confess, that as the redemption of the soul, or its salvation, is of infinite value; so the price that procures it, must be equivalent, and nothing short of infinite.—page 217.*

In summing up the controversy between Samuel Scandre and himself, George Whitehead states a number of questions, to which he has given answers, containing, as he says, "a plain intimation of his sense," concerning the points therein treated of. We shall quote some of them, viz.

"Question 1.—What was the nature and extent of Christ's sufferings?"

"Answer.—Not an undergoing, infinite wrath, or vindictive justice, (so called,) at the hands of his Father, (for that is the just reward of rebels against God, Christ, and free grace;) but first, the weight and burthen of sin and grief of soul, because thereof, as seeing the punishment and wrath incurred by the rebellious. Second. the fury of his persecutors, in his undergoing that cruel death of the cross, inflicted on his body, by wicked hands and murderers; so that his sufferings were twofold, both inward and outward. Third, his real desire, travail of soul, and good will, through all, was for the benefit and good of *all mankind, even for the whole world, for whom he suffered and died*, that all who receive him, might be spiritually influenced with his holy life, and partake of his mind and will, which stood in subjection to the Father.

"Question 2.—What was the true signification, *intent* and *ends* of Christ's sufferings?"

"Answer.—First, to evince God's long suffering towards all men, for whom Christ gave himself a ransom for a testimony in due time. Second, the *appeasement* of wrath and severity, so far as to grant *remission on true repentance*. Third, the end of the law and first covenant, and the shadows and curse of it, as threatened, to impose the terms of it. Fourth, to introduce the new covenant administration; Christ being the Mediator of it. Fifth, to show God's great condescension to receive poor lost man again, on the terms of this new

covenant, reinforced by the death of his Son, that man coming into this new covenant, he might experience a real agreement with God, even in the Son of his love."

"Question 3.—How far the light in man is necessary, and answers the intent and ends of Christ's sufferings?"

"Answer.—It is absolutely necessary to salvation, being that divine principle of light within, which directly guides all them that obey it, into the way and dispensation of the new covenant, whereby they secretly experience the *real intent, virtue, and ends* of Christ's sufferings and blood."

[Query—Can those who deny the real intent, virtue, and ends of Christ's sufferings and blood, be guided by the light, since George Whitehead says that this light, when *obeyed*, leads all into the experience of them.]

"Question 6.—The satisfaction, what? And in what did it consist?"

"Answer.—First, Not rigid payment from Christ to God. Second, Not of the nature of payment for all sins past, present, and to come, (as stated by sin pleasers.) Third, Not Christ's undergoing infinite wrath or revenge from his Father, for these were never exacted nor required of him; but the satisfaction was *in Christ*, as the Son of the Father's love, the delight of his soul, and as he was a sacrifice of a sweet smelling savour to Him: both the Father and the Son, condescended, in one and the same infinite love for man's recovery, out of sin and death, and for his deliverance from wrath to come; being confessed to be equally kind to man, and equally angry at man's sin; God so loved the world that he freely sent his only begotten Son, &c. And in the same love, the Son freely gave his life, yea, even himself, a ransom for all, for a testimony in due time.

"Question 7.—What is true justification?"

"Answer.—It is properly and strictly, a making man just, (viz. through the washing of regeneration.) It is, also, not only *God's pardoning sins past for Christ's sake, through faith in his name*; but, also, God's absolute accepting, owning, and blessing all them who faithfully obey, persevere, and walk in the light and law of the new covenant.

"Question 8.—What is the true or real imputation of righteousness?"

"Answer.—It is the same with justification, as it relates to God's reckoning or esteeming that man righteous, that partakes of the everlasting righteousness of Christ, by a living faith in him: and so the same righteousness and holiness of Christ, as inwardly revealed, and brought forth in the new creature, that is made conformable to his image; and so all the blessed fruits and effects of Christ's power and inward work of righteousness, as true faith, love, obedience, sincerity, holiness, integrity of spirit to God, are acceptable to him, accounted of, and reckoned unto his people for righteousness, and *all still for Christ's sake*, who is the Author and Finisher of true, living, saving, justifying faith; as Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him for righteousness, we say then that Abraham's faith was so reckoned or imputed to him. It has been by some confest, (as be-

(tween God and the creature,) that there can be no liking one another, without likeness of disposition; nor doth God receive man into actual friendship with himself, without being renewed after his image." Pages 239, 240, 241.

The compilers of the pamphlet having quoted from George Whitehead, to prove that his belief was similar to Elias Hicks', we have thought it proper to add the foregoing to their extracts. We leave the reader to make the comparison of the sentiments of the two persons, being fully convinced that every candid mind, will at once perceive that the doctrines are entirely different.

To satisfy every reader that George Whitehead fully believed in the outward manifestation in a body of flesh, as well as the inward appearance of our blessed Lord, we subjoin the following declaration of his faith, with which he concludes his Supplement to the Switch for the Snake; viz.

"Seeing our adversary, and his confederates, so much insist upon the words *without us*, Christ as *without us*, (and sometimes gives him the character of an *outward* Christ, as if he were not an *inward* Christ, inwardly anointed,) I may take leave a little to follow them in their terms; yet with a real respect and honour to the true Messiah, the very Christ, the anointed of God, of whom all his holy prophets gave witness, Acts x. 4. namely, we believe and confess, that this very Christ of God, the only begotten son of God, was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary *without us*, that he was born in Bethlehem of Judea *without us*, that he lived an innocent, sinless life, preached most blessed and excellent doctrine *without us*, that he wrought most eminent and wonderful miracles *without us*, that he went about doing good *without us*, that he was crucified, and put to death, by wicked hands, (without the gates of Jerusalem,) *without us*, that by the power of God, he revived and rose again the third day, *without us*, that after he was raised from the dead, he showed himself alive after his passion, by many infallible proofs, unto his disciples, *without us*, being seen of them forty days, after which he ascended into heaven, being seen to ascend, *without us*, and a cloud received him out of their sight, who beheld him ascend. Unto whom it was said, by the two angels present, This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner, as ye have seen him go into heaven, Acts i. 3, 9, 10, 11, and doubtless, when he so comes, and all his mighty angels with him; it will be in great glory and open triumph; and he will in that day be greatly glorified in his saints, and admired in all of them that believe. 2 Thes. i. 7, 8, 9, 10.

"But now I must not stop here, we must not leave this same Jesus Christ all *without us*, we must humbly consider, and own him, as he is *within us* also. As Christ is the Word of God, that true light which enlightens every man coming into the world, John i. 9. He is *within us*. As in him was life, and the life was the light of men, he is *within us*; his life, as the light of men is *within us*, John i. 4. As Christ is the light of the world, given to lead men out of darkness, and to give the light of life to all who follow him, John viii. 12. He is *within men*, *within us*, to lead us out of that darkness and cor-

ruption that was in us. As Christ is given for the light of the gentiles, and for a covenant unto the people, and to be God's salvation to the ends of the earth, Isa. xlii. 6, and xlix. 6. Acts xiii. 47. He must be known as such *within* them. Seeing his coming, was that we might have life, and that we might have it more abundantly, John x. 10. This life we must have *within us*. Jesus said, If a man love me, he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him, John xiv. 23. which must be *within us*. Abide in me, and I *in* you, (-aith Christ.) as the branch cannot bring forth fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me, John xv. 4. Therefore, if we abide in Christ, he abides *in us*. The branches must abide *in* the vine, to partake of the life and virtue thereof *in* them, to cause fruit. John xiv. 18. I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you, (said Christ.) Verse 20. At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and you *in* me, and I *in* you. Therefore we must know Christ *within us*, if we be his true followers. John xvii. 22, 23. Where Christ saith, And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them, that they may be one, even as we are one. I *in* them, and thou *in* me, that they may be made perfect in one, that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me. And verse 26. And I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it, that the love wherewith thou hast loved me, may be *in* them, and I *in* them. What's more clear, than Christ's own testimony for his being *within us*, i. e. *within* all his true followers especially. 2 Cor. xiii. 5. Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves: Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates. Therefore, they who are not reprobates, but in the faith, know that Jesus Christ is *within them*. Colos. i. 27. To whom God would make known, what is the riches of the glory of this mystery, which is Christ *in you* the hope of glory. Therefore, the saints know Christ *within them*, to be the hope of glory to them. Gal. iv. 6. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son *into* your hearts, crying Abba Father. The Son of God is, therefore, by his spirit *within us*, who are sons of God. Galat. iv. 19. My little children, of whom I travail in birth again, until Christ be formed *in you*. Rom. viii. 29. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate, to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn *in* many brethren. Therefore the son of God is *within* them.

“Rev. iii. 20. Behold I stand at the door and knock, if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come *in* to him, and will sup with him, and he with me. Was not this the Son of God, the faithful and true witness, who thus spake, verse 14? And where is that door that must be opened unto him? Many more instances might be shown for the nearness of Christ, with, and *in* his faithful followers and members: And blessed are they who truly believe in his name, and follow him in the regeneration.”—Page 544.

To the last quotation from George Whitehead, the compilers have appended the following note :

“The authenticity of this text, was doubted by Richard Claridge, a learned and highly esteemed writer among primitive Friends, and it is now admitted to be spurious, even by many Trinitarians.”

The text here alluded to is 1 John v. 7. “For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.”

After a careful examination of the writings of Richard Claridge, we do not find he has declared that he ever entertained any such doubt.

In his “Essay on the Doctrine of the Trinity,” he has placed this text on the title page as a motto, with the usual reference of chapter and verse, which it is highly improbable so “learned and highly esteemed a writer” would have done, if he had doubted its authenticity. He commences the treatise with these words: “Although it be, doubtless, the duty of every Christian man unfeignedly to believe the testimony of the Holy Scripture, concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, yet the notion of *three distinct persons*, subsisting in the unity of the Godhead, having its rise not from the Holy Scriptures, but from men’s imaginations, is not necessarily to be received. ‘For whatsoever is not read therein, viz. the Holy Scriptures, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought necessary, or requisite to salvation, as the sixth article of the Church of England declareth. And as in our doings, that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God;’ article 17, so in a point of faith proposed to us, as necessary to be believed in order to eternal salvation, it should be expressly declared in the Holy Scriptures. For ‘as works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of the spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ,’ article 13; so, according to this article, how can that faith be pleasant unto God, which is not expressly declared of in the Holy Scriptures, which the Church of England itself says, are the only rule of faith? There is sufficient reason to dissent from her, in this point, even upon her own articles. Her doctrine of the Trinity, as delivered and explained, article 1, and in the confession commonly called the creed of Athanasius, is not expressly declared in the Holy Scriptures, and because it is not, may therefore, according to her own principles, be justly rejected. I am of Hierom’s mind in things of this nature, ‘We do not believe them, because we do not read them in the sacred records.’ Again, a little before, he saith, ‘As we deny not those things which are written there, so we refuse those that are not written; for all that we speak,’ saith he, ‘we ought to affirm from the Holy Scriptures.’ For they are a sufficient declaration, of all the necessary and fundamental articles of the Christian religion, in common to be believed; and the best outward rule or standard, extant in the world, to examine the principles and doctrines of men by; and therefore, nothing ought to be required or imposed, as a common article of the Christian religion, which is not expressed in plain scripture terms.”—Works, pages 389, 390.

He then proceeds to state the ground of his dissent from the doctrine of the Church of England on this point, from which it ap

pears, that it arises wholly, from the use of the unscriptural term Trinity, and the notion of Three distinct and separate persons in one Godhead. After treating these points at some length, and adducing the testimony of several protestant writers, to show, that they have given rise to many inconsistent and erroneous ideas upon this solemn and mysterious subject, he concludes very properly that it is safest and most becoming, for men to express their belief in those terms, which the Holy Ghost has been pleased to reveal.— On page 414, he says—

“By keeping to scripture revelation we shall declare our faith in a form of *sound and safe words*; but if we go beyond those sacred records for our creed, there may quickly be as many symbols of faith, as there are *fond and ambitious innovators*.

“Therefore in this, and all other articles of faith and doctrines of religion, in common to be believed, in order to eternal salvation, let not the opinions, explications, or conceptions of men, which are often dubious, various, or erroneous, be esteemed as a rule or standard, but let every one rely upon the divine testimony of the Holy Scriptures, which declare that “God is one, and there is none other besides him; and that the one God is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: or, as it is expressed 1st John v. 7—The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost. Though that text is suspected by many learned men, it being not met with, as Poole informs us, in Nazianzen, Athanasius, Didymus, Chrysostom, Cyril, Hilary, Augustine, and Bede; nor urged in the Nicene Council against Arius; for though it quote verse 6, yet it omits verse 7th, either because they found it not in the original, or doubted its authority.

“Neither is it found in many ancient Greek and Latin copies, nor in the Syriac, Arabic, or Ethiopic versions, nor in some ancient Greek impressions, as that of Strasburg by Wolfius Cephalinus, 1524, and that of Paris by Simon Colinaeus, 1534, nor in the German version of Martin Luther, as Erasmus, the Divines of Lovain, Beza, and others, have observed.

“Nor is it, as Dr. Hammond says, in the King’s manuscript at St. James. See also what Franciscus Junius, Selden, Paulus Colomesius, and Bishop Burnet say of the omission of it.

“*But whether that verse be dubious or authentic, is not much material, because in other places of scripture the substance of it is recorded.*”—Pages 414, 415.

We suppose that this last quotation from Richard Claridge has induced the compilers to make the assertion, that he doubted the authenticity of this text in 1st John. It will at once be seen, however, that Richard Claridge himself, does not say that he doubted its authenticity; but merely that this text was *suspected by many learned men*, and gives their reasons for so doing. Had the reasons, which induced them to suspect (not actually to doubt) the passage, produced the same impression on his mind, he would not have concluded the statement in the manner he has; for to say, “whether it be dubious or authentic, is not much material,” is an expression, which shows that he had not decided it to be dubious; since it might be safely used, in the sense he has it, by one who was con-

tending for its authenticity. The most, therefore, that can be drawn from all that he has said on its doubtfulness, is that he asserted many learned men suspected it.

The concluding paragraph above quoted, is however, a strong proof of his belief in its genuineness, when viewed in connexion with the fact, that he has not only placed it as his motto on the title page of his book, but also declared in this essay, that it is the fittest language whereby to express our belief in the Holy Three. It is scarcely to be supposed, that so learned a writer, would hazard the credit and force of a controversial essay, on so momentous and serious a subject, by building its authority, upon a text of scripture whose authenticity he doubted. It would certainly be an evidence of great weakness in him, and augur very unfavourably of the cause for which he was contending. A further confirmation of this view, is afforded by the great care he takes, to guard his readers against denying the doctrine, in consequence of any doubt which some might have, of the authenticity of the text. For after stating the suspicion of these learned men respecting it, he adds—*“But whether that verse be dubious or authentic, is not much material, because in other places of scripture, the substance of it is recorded;”* thus clearly showing, that he was an unfeigned believer in the doctrine which it contained.

From the note made by the compilers of the pamphlet on the subject, and their unqualified assertion, that he doubted its authenticity, as well as from the object of their work; viz: to prove that “primitive friends,” concurred with Elias Hicks, in denying the doctrine which is inculcated in the text, and the divinity of Jesus Christ; it might possibly be inferred, by some uninformed readers, that Richard Claridge did not believe in the doctrine of the “Three that bear record in Heaven;” but for proof that this was not the case, the extracts which we have here given, as well as those from his defence of William Penn and the early Quakers, against the invidious accusations of Francis Bugg, inserted in our first chapter, are amply sufficient. His “Essay on the Trinity,” concludes with this excellent paragraph:—

“The Holy Scriptures are the great Charter of the Christian Faith and doctrine, and unto them, should all appeals be made in matters relating unto both. So was it observed by the Ancient Fathers and by the first Reformers: they constantly appealed to scripture, in all questions and controversies of religion. And though in sundry instances, they deviated from the path of truth, *it was not because* they appealed to scripture, but because they attended not to the teaching of the Spirit of Truth, in their own hearts, whose prerogative it is, to open and guide the understandings of those infallibly therein, who humbly wait for, and faithfully follow its conduct.”—Page 419.

The compilers likewise inform us in their note, that the verse in question, “is now admitted to be spurious, even by many Trinitarians.” We grant that some persons who are denominated Trinitarians, have been so far influenced by the objections which have been made to the passage, as to be induced to suspect its authenti-

city. It is equally true however, that the number of these is small when compared with those who are satisfied of its genuineness. The learned bishop of St. David's, who has devoted much time and attention to this subject, and whose extensive research, entitles his opinion to great weight, has this observation respecting it; "I can say with truth, that every renewed examination of the subject has added to my convictions of its authenticity." Nolan in his profound and interesting "Inquiry into the integrity of the Greek Vulgate," after stating the internal and external evidence in support of the text, adds—"I trust nothing further can be wanting, to convince any ingenuous mind that 1st John v. 7, really proceeded from St. John the Evangelist." Dr. Hales in a very able and learned work on the subject of the Trinity, speaks with equal confidence of the authenticity of the verse. "To the authority of Griesbach on this question, (he says) I shall not hesitate to oppose and prefer the authority of a celebrated German editor and critic, the learned Ernesti, with whose observations I shall close this minute and elaborate survey, of the whole external and internal evidence, which I humbly trust, will be found exhaustive of the subject, and set the controversy at rest in future." Grier, in his reply to Dr. Milner's "End of religious controversy," after noticing "the *invincible arguments*" of Nolan, says, "I feel compelled to abandon my former prejudices against the verse, and to think, that a person should almost as soon doubt the genuineness of the rest of St. John's Epistle, as that of the disputed passage." A late edition of the Greek testament by Edward Valpy, a very learned Greek scholar, retains among other passages 1st John v. 7.

It may be proper to remark, that the investigation of the subject is still industriously continued; and as there are yet to be examined, many hundred ancient manuscripts in the Vatican, and other libraries, many of which may be still older than those we are at present possessed of; we should certainly have the most positive evidence of corruption or interpolation, to induce us to abandon a passage so well supported, by internal and external evidence, and which in the deliberate and sober judgment, of many of the most learned biblical critics, is equally genuine with any of the apostle John's writings. Should it however happen, that future researches, present us with evidence, sufficient to invalidate the great weight of testimony by which it is now supported, the absence of the text will not diminish the irresistible evidence, for the doctrine which it teaches, since other unsuspected passages, prove it in the most clear and unequivocal manner.

CHAPTER VI.

Remarks upon the Quotations made by the Compilers of the Pamphlet, from the works of WILLIAM BAYLY.

THE compilers have presented us with several extracts from the writings of this author, the object of which we are at a loss to determine, since they do not favour a denial of the divinity or atonement of our blessed Lord, but, on the contrary, afford sufficient proof of his sincere faith in both, and are, therefore, no evidence in support of the notions of Elias Hicks.

The first of them is on pages 38, 39, of the pamphlet, and is a reply to an objection made by some of the opponents of Friends, that they seldom addressed their prayers to God, in the name of Jesus Christ. To this William Bayly answers :

☞ [“First, I do affirm, that they who preach and pray in the spirit, and power, and light, and wisdom of God, do pray in the name of Jesus ; for Jesus is but a name which was given unto that, which was before that name was, which the angel called a holy thing, and also said, that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God. And also, it is written, behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel, which being interpreted, is God with us. So that this one holy thing, in process of time, according to the knowledge of his works and operations, in and by many, hath several, many, and various names given unto it.”] ☞ Page 158.

It is obvious that William Bayly fully asserts his belief in the Godhead and pre-existence of our Lord Jesus Christ, and his miraculously taking flesh of the Virgin Mary, in this very passage which the compilers have quoted. In the subsequent paragraph he calls him the Seed of the Woman, the Word of God, the faithful and true Witness, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Lord our Righteousness, the Prince of Peace, the tried Stone and Rock, the Mediator, the Child, the Morning Star, and the good Shepherd, that lays down his life for the sheep. He then argues, that as the name Jesus was given to this holy thing, which in different ages had been characterized by these glorious titles, so those who prayed to him, in his name or power, under any of these various characters, did pray in the name of Jesus, though they might not always use this word to designate him by. The great difference between the Christian doctrines of William Bayly and the dogmas of Elias Hicks, is sufficiently proved by the extracts which the compilers have made, since the latter declares our blessed Saviour was not the Son of God, until after the baptism of John, denies his miraculous conception, and so far from admitting

that he is the mighty God, says, that the spirit, or light, was dispensed to him as man, in such *proportion* as was necessary for the work he had to perform. Now as a proportion, or part of any thing, cannot be the whole, so it follows, from the assertion of Elias Hicks, that the fulness of the Godhead did not dwell in him, and that he was no otherwise *divine*, than as every Christian is.

The next quotation from William Bayly is taken from his reply to the following objection, viz. "But how could Adam be *in Christ*, before Christ came into the world, or was born of the Virgin, seeing Adam was made in the image of God long before? Could he be made *in Christ*, or *by Christ*, before *Christ was*? How can these things be? Answer. ¶ "The word Christ, in letters CHRIST, was not known, (neither was there any occasion of them,) *before man had transgressed*, and lost that life, in and by which he was created; but the power, which *was in that man, or body, which suffered without the gate of Jerusalem, was before the body or creature was made*; and it was the power of the Most High, which overshadowed the Virgin; and said HE, a body hast thou prepared ME; mark, this was the Life and Power in the body, which spoke, *in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwelt*: and he spake. and prayed to his Father, which was in him: so though HE was not known by *them* letters, or the name Christ, yet HE *was with the Father*, glorified *before the world began, and was the Word in the beginning, by whom the world was made, who said 'Before Abraham was, I am;'* but the name, or letters, *Christ*, was not until many hundred years after: ¶ So thou mayst see, that the Christ of God, the Word, by whom all things were made; was, before it was made, glorified with the Father, before Abraham, and Adam, and Moses, and the names or letters, were; the image of God, the blessed seed."—Page 94.

This quotation furnishes us with another full confession of the faith of William Bayly, in the pre-existence of our blessed Lord, as the Eternal Word, by whom all things were made; in his miraculous conception, Godhead, and Manhood, which suffered without the gates of Jerusalem; and presents a striking contrast with the dogmas of Elias Hicks, who, as we have repeatedly shown, denies both of the former, making Jesus Christ no more than a man.

On the same page of the pamphlet, we have a short quotation, in which the author declares that there are but two seeds, the seed of the serpent or devil, and the seed of the woman, Christ Jesus, the same yesterday, to day, and forever; who, by a manifestation of his Holy Spirit, is now appearing in the hearts of ten thousands of his saints. Here are two points in which he differs from Elias Hicks. The existence of the devil, and Christ being the seed of the woman, promised to Adam and Eve after they had fallen.

At the top of page 40, of the pamphlet, we find a short quotation from William Bayly, in which he applies the term "Elder Brother" to the *person* of Jesus Christ. The compilers have italicised these words, as if they would have us to infer from thence, that he considers our Lord to be no more than a man. In this, however, they are greatly mistaken, since, in the very paragraph from which they have garbled their quotation, beginning it at a semicolon, and end-

ing it at a comma, he fully acknowledges his divinity. It is as follows, viz:—

“This we do declare, and that, in and by the spirit of the Lord, that we are, in our measures, redeemed by the precious blood of his Son, Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God that takes away the sin, and reconciles unto Him, and to all men, from that nature and spirit of enmity from whence the wars and fightings come; [and we are “taught, led, and guided by, and are possessors of a *measure* of “the same spirit of grace and truth, that was in *that person*, Christ, “our Elder Brother, that suffered patiently, the contradictions and “false accusations of sinners, as a Lamb, without the gates of Jerusalem, of whose resurrection and life we are eye witnesses,] [and we are even of his majesty and glory, and the coming of his kingdom with power, full of grace and truth, so that the tree being now made good, the fruit is the same also; and a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, viz. wickedness, enmity, mischief, or violence, against any of the children of men, upon the face of the earth: so we have not only the name, or outward profession of Christ, in words, as it is in the world, but we are made partakers of a *measure* of the same divine nature; and we are now, (being regenerated, raised, and renewed into his own image of truth and love, righteousness and peace,) *his offspring*, and HE is our God and Father, who rebukes the strong nations, and makes wars to cease, to the ends of the earth, glory and honour be to Him in the highest, over all, forever.”—Pages 169, 170.

It will be seen by the brackets, which enclose the compilers' quotation, that they have omitted the leading part of the paragraph, and ended their extract at a comma; thus concealing those parts where William Bayly declares his belief in the divinity, majesty, and glory of the Lord Jesus Christ. The injustice of this garbling is greatly increased, by the sentiment which they thus attempt to force upon him, which is no less than a denial of his eternal divinity. The term Elder Brother is strictly confined, to the *person* or *manhood* of Christ, and is evidently not at all intended to equalize him with man, since, in the same sentence, he asserts that *we* have *only a measure* of that spirit, which dwelt in fulness in Him, speaks of him in language, which can only be applicable to the Deity, and closes the paragraph by styling him, “our God and Father,” “glory and honour be to him in the highest, over all, forever.” So that it is manifest he was a firm believer in all that is declared of him in Holy Scripture.

It is but proper to remark, however, that the appellation of elder brother, even when applied *solely* to the humanity of our blessed and adorable Redeemer, is very seldom used by any of the early Friends. We have never met with it but in one instance, except in the works of this author.—And although our Lord was pleased to call his disciples, “my brethren,” and condescendingly to say, “Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother;” yet Friends considered it more becoming the dependent and unworthy condition of man, to adopt that form of expression, which he was pleased to commend in his immediate

followers, "Ye call me Master and Lord, *and ye say well*, for so I am."

Immediately following this extract, we have another from the same author, in which he addresses those, who are living above the just witness for God in the soul, and oppressing and persecuting it by their wicked works, assuring them that Christ *without*, will be of no benefit to them, unless they become obedient to the manifestation of his Holy Spirit within. He also asserts, that whosoever "preacheth any other Saviour, Gospel, or way to eternal salvation, but the Immanuel, the Son of God; his life, power, and wisdom in him, to redeem his soul (which is *in him*,) from the curse, wrath, and power of darkness, which is in man;—yea, I say, if an angel should preach contrary to this Gospel, the light and power of God, which is everlasting, whose foundation in man is already laid; I say, from the presence of the Lord God he is accursed, &c." This gospel which William Bayly preached, was the same that the apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ preached, and concerning which, Paul declared *that man accursed*, who preached any other. Surely, then, the language both of this eminent apostle, and of William Bayly, contain a most solemn sentence upon all those who are rejecting the holiest doctrines of that very gospel, and even denying him who gave it to the world, and ratified it with no less seal, than the sacrifice of his own precious life.

The quotation closes, with his testimony against those who taught people, that they might be saved by Christ *without* them, while the light of Christ in the conscience, condemned them; and persuaded them to hazard the eternal welfare of their souls by trusting solely to a redemption, *wrought by Christ without them*, while their sins remain in them; and that redemption from sin could not be witnessed in this life: such he declares to be ministers and messengers of Satan. It will appear from this, that while William Bayly denies the possibility of redemption by the blood of Christ, without repentance and amendment of life; he is far from rejecting the virtue and efficacy of that blood, to all those who come in faith unto God, by Christ. Because he preached so strenuously, the indispensable necessity of knowing the inward work, it does not follow, that he denied the outward, though the compilers would, doubtless, have us think so, from the manner in which they have italicised his words. This unjust and uncharitable construction was put upon his words, by an illiberal opponent of the early Quakers, of which William Bayly complains, as being an injurious reflection upon his christian reputation. We sincerely wish that the compilers may profit by what he says. The essay in which it is contained is entitled, "The True Christ Owned, in a few *plain words of truth*, by way of reply to all such, professors or profane, who lay to the charge of the elect people of God, called Quakers, *that they deny the blood of Christ, and his body and resurrection, and that they deny the Lord that bought them, and trample the blood of the covenant under their feet.*" It is inserted in his works, page 573 and seq. The following declaration of William Bayly's faith, concerning Christ Jesus, is extracted from it, viz.

“The second query and charge, ‘But do you own salvation by the Man Christ, that was born of the Virgin Mary, and that was baptized of John in Jordan, and that preached in the world, and was crucified, dead and buried, and rose again the third day, and ascended into heaven, and there sitteth, at the right hand of God, and shall come again to judge the world?’ [Answer]—(Now mark, if we *speak the truth in the uprightness of our hearts*, and say YEA to all this; it doth not at all satisfy them,) but they further proceed with terms beyond what is written: [viz.] ‘But do you believe in the *visible man* Christ with flesh and bones, which the people fastened their eyes on, when he read in the book of Isaiah? So that Christ Jesus was a visible man, with *flesh and bones*, as he himself said to Thomas, a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have; so they did see him after he was risen from the dead, and this was visible. Do you, Quakers, own salvation *alone* by this *visible* person, Christ Jesus? For we believe you do not, because you preach up a light within and not the visible man, Christ, for salvation; and so we publish you to be them, that deny the Lord that bought them, and so are of anti-christ and false prophets.’

“Answer—The former part is here answered already, with a word of truth, YEA; and as to the latter part thereof, I have this to say, that we do not deny but own and believe, that he was the Son of God, and the true Christ and the Saviour of the world, that did appear to his disciples, and did eat and drink with them, and talk with them, after he was risen from the dead: who said, A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have; and all that is, or was spoken, and written by the prophets, and apostles of Christ, concerning him, what he was, or what he did or said, *we do really believe without any equivocating*, as some of you usually charge us with, and *with reservations*; to which we may say, as the apostle, if our gospel be hid, or *reserved*, it is hid to them that are lost, whose minds the god of this world hath blinded, that do not believe, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ who is the image of God, should shine unto them: read 2 Cor. iv. throughout; you that talk against the light within, and understand what ye read, and what ye are crying out against. It’s no less than the Son of God, if you will believe Paul, who witnessed the Son of God revealed in him, and Christ, the Son of God, said, I am the light of the world.

“But as to your charge, I say further, that we own *salvation by no other Christ than Him*, the true apostles preached, *nor no other gospel*, or name under heaven by which men shall be saved, but by Jesus Christ; who is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. And for the word *visible*, its yours, and not Christ’s, nor his apostles’, nor mine, and so I leave it out, and keep to the form of sound words, as the apostle exhorts, and not meddle with it, *lest I add to his words*, and he reprove me;—but he that took upon him the likeness of sinful flesh, and the form a servant, and was found in fashion as a man, and made in the likeness of men, being in the form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God; this Christ Jesus we own, and witness salvation by, and by no other: And though Christ Jesus spoke at that time, and upon that occasion, of his flesh and bones.

that they might believe, that it was he, that was risen from the dead, whom the chief-priests, Scribes, Pharisees, and elders had caused to be crucified, which before he had declared to them, and so upbraided them with their unbelief in that particular; yet we need not be upbraided *with unbelief*, by any, as you have done, saying, we deny the resurrection of the body; but we do really believe that Christ is risen from the dead, and entered into his glory, according to the scriptures, who said to his disciples at the supper, "I will not drink henceforth, of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you, in my Father's kingdom, and that after he was risen from the dead, he would go before them into Galilee: so these things they did witness fulfilled, according as he had said, whose cup of blessing which they blessed, was it not the communion of the blood of Christ, &c.? And did not his blood cleanse them from all sin, as they walked in the light, in which their fellowship and communion was? Read with understanding in the fear of the Lord: and so mark your great argument upon what occasion he thus appeared, and spoke; A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have: Did he thus speak, that his disciples should *always* look after flesh and bones to appear amongst them, and to be with them, and comfort them forever? or did he not appear to them in another form, and last of all did he not appear to Paul, who was called Saul, as to one born out of due time, and how did he appear to him?—Mark, when it pleased God to reveal his Son in me, &c."—Pages 582—585.

It will be seen from this declaration that William Bayly sincerely and unfeignedly, without any shuffling, equivocating, or reservation, owned Jesus Christ both outwardly and inwardly, as the true Saviour and Redeemer, and held forth no other thing whatever as the Saviour, but HE that took upon him that body of flesh, and was offered up without the gates of Jerusalem, a propitiation for the sins of the world. Let the reader compare these doctrines with those avowed by Elias Hicks in his sermons and letters, and he will at once perceive how great the contrast is between his notions, and genuine Quakerism.

From the same essay which we have here quoted, the compilers of the pamphlet have extracted some queries, which William Bayly addressed to the opposers of the Society of Friends with whom he had the dispute, which gave occasion for writing the essay. Matthew Caffin, one of the disputants, asserted—"My Saviour that I own salvation by, is that visible Man Christ, that is ascended up into heaven, and there sitteth at the right hand of God, that *visible man*, with the same *flesh and bones*, which he took of the Virgin Mary."—This he said in opposition to the doctrine of the apostle, that the Word was nigh in the heart and in the mouth, even the engrafted word which was able to save the soul; *wholly denying* the latter, and asserting that the visible man of flesh and bones was the *alone* Saviour. This occasioned William Bayly to query with them.

☞ [1st. Whether there be any more Saviours of the immortal soul but one, that is able to save it, or to bring salvation to it— "Yea or Nay? If you say nay, there is *but one* able to save, and 'able to destroy as the Lord said, Beside me there is no Saviour.

“ and there is *no other name* under heaven by which men can be saved, *but Jesus Christ*.

“ 2d. Then, whether the *visible* person of flesh and bones, be the *only Saviour*, seeing the apostle saith, ‘The engrafted word is able to save the soul, and the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men? And who was Enoch’s Saviour and the prophets’, who were before that *visible* flesh and bones was?

“ 3d. Whether the *visible* person of flesh and bones, be the engrafted Word? Or whether *that person*, hath appeared to all men, seeing that which bringeth salvation hath? I leave it to the witness of God in you all, to consider and judge. For if you say, ‘the visible man, with visible flesh and bones, is the *alone Saviour*, (as you have said,) then whether this visible man be in the hearts of people? For the apostle preached Christ, the Word nigh in the heart, and in the mouth; and the ingrafted Word is able to save the soul; so he did not preach a visible Christ with flesh and bones as you do, (which W. B. [an opponent] said was not Christ; but the Word.) And Paul preached God, that made the world, &c. that was not far from every one of us, the *invisible* God, but you preach a visible man, with flesh and bones at a great distance from all people, above where the sun, moon, and stars are, as Matthew Caffin said, his Saviour was, which he owned for salvation.”—pages 600, 601.

The candid reader will at once discern the real meaning of William Bayly in these queries. It is not to deny or undervalue the outward coming of the Lord Jesus Christ in the flesh, but to show the inconsistency of that doctrine, which would make the manhood *alone* the Saviour, distinct entirely from the eternal divinity, the fulness of the Godhead which dwelt in the manhood; for this was the opinion of his opponent.

The compilers have italicised the words “he did not preach a visible Christ, with flesh, and bones,” &c. alluding to the apostle Paul. They would doubtless have us construe this, into a denial of the manhood of the Lord Jesus, and to conclude that the Quakers believed in Christ, no otherwise, than as he is the Word, nigh in the heart. Such, however, was not the meaning of William Bayly, as we shall presently prove. George Keith, after he had apostatised from the true Quaker doctrine, quoted this very passage from William Bayly, and charged him with holding those sentiments which the compilers would have us to infer from it. See Keith’s “Serious Call.” The reply to Keith after quoting the passage, adds:—

“ 1st. If this be truly cited, the first part is according to plain scripture, that the apostles did so preach Christ, the Word nigh, and the ingrafted Word—See Romans x., James i. 21. Therefore, George Keith, in placing this among those, he terms, vile and monstrous doctrines, has accused the holy apostles, with vile and monstrous doctrines, to show his own vileness. 2d, ‘He did not preach a visible or fleshly Christ as you do; *As who do?* Doubtless they were *such opposers of Christ in spirit*, or his light in man, as preached Christ *only in the flesh*, and *only far remote* from men.

Whereas the holy apostles preached him *both as come in the flesh, and in the Spirit ; both without and within also.*—Serious Examination of G. Keith, pages 20, 21.

It will thus appear, that neither W. Bayly, nor any of the early Quakers, preached Christ *within*, to the exclusion of Christ *without*; but sincerely owned him, both as he appeared at Jerusalem, without them, in the flesh, and also as he is revealed by a measure of his Holy Spirit in the hearts of his people. But we have yet further evidence upon the subject, from W. Bayly himself, who seems to have been aware that illiberal opposers might pervert the true meaning of his words, in order to traduce his christian reputation. He, therefore, states the following objection and answer, in the very same essay, from which the compilers have extracted; and only two pages from their quotation, viz :

“ But some may say, if God and Christ, and Justification and salvation, and all must be known within; then what benefit have you by the death and sufferings of Christ? And for what end came he into the world? And what advantage have any people by these things?

“ Answer.—*Much every way*; for first, He, in his birth, and coming in the flesh, was the opening of a door, (though under a veil to the carnal eye,) to see into the mysteries of his kingdom; which was at hand, as he told them; as his being born of a virgin, and then being carried into Egypt, and then being brought back again, as also his being kept out of the inn, which was full of guests in the days of taxing, and his being wrapped in swaddling clothes, and laid in a manger, showed his entertainment in the world, and among the professors of all sorts, that saw not the *invisible Life*, but looked at the visible appearance, and so his face was more marred than any man’s—and his form more than the sons of men.

“ And then in his preaching, he told for what end he was born, and came into the world, to bear witness to the truth; and so he fulfilled all the types and shadows, and sacrifices under the law, *by his offering once for all*, and ended them forever; and so a body was prepared; to do his Father’s will, who would not have any more such sacrifices and offerings, but a new and living way must be consecrated for the people, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh, which *was offered up once for all*; So here, all the outward offerings, (which were many and often,) ended; and now the offering is in righteousness, in that which exceeds the Scribes and Pharisees; and the true worship is now, as he said, in the spirit and in the truth. And so, as they offered the blood of bulls and goats, and such like things, in their sacrifices for sin and transgression, *so Christ, at his death and sufferings, offered up a body of flesh and blood*, which was prepared, (as I said,) *to that end of his Father*; so he did his Father’s will, with which He was well pleased, saying, *this is my beloved son, hear ye him*; so that *God is in Christ, reconciled*; and out of him there is *no reconciliation, nor acceptable sacrifice*. And now, all must hear him, who said I am the Way, the Truth and the Life, and I am the Light of the world; believe in the Light; whose name is called the Word of God; which his ministers, in his stead, preached, nigh in the

heart and in the mouth, and forbad saying, Who shall ascend up into Heaven to bring him down, or descend to fetch him up, &c. But the Word of reconciliation they had, and this they preached, that people might come to Christ, and be reconciled to God; and their fellowship was with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ, and the blood of Christ did cleanse them; and yet they desire to know him no more after the flesh: but these things are parables to the wise men of the world. Therefore, I may conclude as the apostle did, without controversy great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory: and so he is out of your sight who deny the Light within, for that gives the knowledge of his glory in the face of Jesus Christ, as ye may read, 2 Cor. iv. 6."—pages 602 to 604.

From this extract it is apparent, how careful the primitive Quakers were, while they enforced that great fundamental doctrine of the christian religion, the manifestation of the spirit of Christ Jesus, given to all men to profit with, to guard against giving any just ground to suspect, that they in any degree lessened, or slighted the unspeakable blessings which resulted to mankind, from the outward coming, and sufferings, and death of the Son of God in the flesh. And although their writings have often been misconstrued to convict them of this most unchristian doctrine, yet their accusers, whether open enemies, or pretended friends, have always been obliged to resort either to mutilation of their writings, or to perversion of their true meaning. When permitted to speak for themselves, they declare to the satisfaction of every candid and ingenuous mind, that they believed without any equivocation or reservation, in all that the scriptures testify concerning the coming, sufferings, death, resurrection, mediation, and intercession of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

On page 41, of the pamphlet, we are presented with a quotation from an essay of W. Bayly's, entitled "A Salvation to the breathing Seed of Israel." The section which contains the extract, is entitled "Concerning Christ's second coming and Kingdom and Reign, and of the Kingdoms of this world becoming his Kingdoms." It commences thus:

"I never read in all the scriptures, as I can remember, of a third coming of Christ personally, in his own single person, or of a personal reign, besides what shall be in his saints. But I have read of his coming the second time, without sin, unto salvation, &c., which the apostles in their days did witness, yea, even his coming and kingdom, as may be mentioned hereafter. I believe most people, in that called Christendom, who have read the scriptures, will confess Christ is come once already, even when he had the body prepared, which he laid down, and took up, without the gates of Jerusalem: this I grant was a personal coming, or the Godhead dwelt in that person, bodily; this we conclude was his first coming, to be manifest in these days; and we believe all the things that are written of him to be really true, and that whatsoever he did or said, must be fulfilled. &c."

“ But now, this being his *first coming*, he tells his disciples while he was yet with them, that “ he must go away, and that it was expedient that he should go away, or else, said he, the Comforter will not come, the which if I go away, I shall send unto you, even the Spirit of Truth, which shall abide with you forever, &c. Yet, notwithstanding sorrow had filled their hearts, though He tells them HE would *come* again unto them, and their hearts should rejoice, and their joy no man should take from them : This was his promise to his disciples, while HE was yet personally with them, and to comfort and strengthen them yet more, yet he told them, that HE THAT WAS WITH THEM, SHOULD BE IN THEM.”—pages 306, 307.

The substance of this confession to the personal and spiritual appearance of our blessed Lord, is so truly scriptural, that we wish to call the attention of our readers particularly to it. So well was the author grounded in the sacred truths recorded in Holy Scripture, so clear and unequivocal did they appear to him, that he supposes *most* people in Christendom, will confess Christ is come already, in that prepared body, which he laid down and took up again, without the gates of Jerusalem. To such a sincere and believing christian, how painful would it be to know, that many of the professed members of that Society, which above all others he loved, as the household of true faith ; and for whose doctrines he endured cruel persecution and imprisonments ; had not only departed from the confession of that Christ which died at Jerusalem, but were quoting *his works* to prove that he did the same !!

He makes a full acknowledgment, not only to all the circumstances relative to the birth, life, and death of the Holy Jesus, confessing to all that the scriptures testify of him ; but what is especially worthy of remark, he declares that *the same Comforter* that was outwardly with his disciples in the flesh, did afterward come again to them in the spirit. That Christ himself, sent them this Comforter, even the Spirit of Truth that should abide with them forever.”— There is a striking contrast here, between the belief of W. Bayly and Elias Hicks, since the latter asserts that it was not the *same* Comforter who was afterward sent to the disciples, but another, *distinct* from Jesus Christ, as is set forth in various places in his sermons.

Immediately following what we last quoted, comes the paragraph which the compilers have selected ; in which W. Bayly speaks of the attachment which the disciples of Christ had for his person, which he thinks to have been for the sake of the excellent spirit which dwelt in him—though he says he means not to slight the person.— The part which the compilers seem to consider peculiarly adapted to this purpose, is his enjoining it on his disciples, to pray to their Father who was in Heaven. He says, [“ And so he taught them “ to pray, Our Father, &c., not to look at his person, and pray to “ *him as a person, without them*, but bid them pray to their Father “ which seeth in secret, who would reward them openly ; and he “ that seeth in secret, searcheth the heart and trieth the reins :] And he bid them pray, thy kingdom come ; and the kingdom of Heaven is within, and the heart and reins, and the searcher of them, is

within; and he bid them wait at Jerusalem, till they were endued with power from on high; and the kingdom of God consisteth in power, &c. So they waited for *his coming and kingdom*, in their days, *after his bodily departure* from them, and also *came to enjoy what they waited for*, and to receive the promise of the Father, which was fulfilled unto them, and in them: For saith the Apostle, We wait for his Son from Heaven; *this was after he had suffered, and was departed from them*; and at length said, *The Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we know him that is true, and are in him that is true; this is the true God and Eternal life, and this life is in his Son.*—page 308.

It is evident from the context, that William Bayly had no intention to inculcate the idea; that prayers were not to be offered up to Christ, or to the Father, in his name. For though he says, the disciples were not to look at his person, or pray to him as a *person without them*, yet the clear distinction which he makes between the Manhood and Godhead, shows that he alluded only to the former—the outward person; and in the same paragraph, he inculcates the necessity of witnessing the Son of God to be come, and recites that passage of John's Epistle, where he is styled, the true God and eternal life, that everlasting and glorious Being to whom all prayers must ascend, and to whom all adoration and praises forever belong. "I have chosen you, said the Holy Jesus, and ordained you; that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father, in my name, he may give it you:" hence all our petitions to the throne of grace, must be offered in the name of Jesus Christ, and they that ask not in his name, their prayers will not be answered, because they ask amiss.

We shall conclude our remarks, with the following extract from a work by this author, entitled "The LAMB'S Government to be Exalted over all, in Israel." The sentiments which it contains, respecting the divinity and offices of Jesus Christ, will strikingly contrast with those of Elias Hicks, and completely acquit William Bayly from the charge of coinciding in his antichristian notions, viz:

"JESUS CHRIST, the only begotten Son of God, the Holy Seed, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, (that lies in wickedness,) in whose mouth guile is not found, whose name is called the Word of God, whom all are to hear, whose kingdom is not of this world, whom God the Father hath raised from the dead, and appointed Heir of all things, and Head over all to his Church, and given Him a name above every name, that at *His name*, every knee should bow, of things in Heaven and things in the earth, and every tongue confess him to be Lord, to the glory of God the Father; whom he hath given for a Leader and Commander of the people, in whom alone is redemption and salvation, and not in any other,—this is the Captain of thy host, Oh Israel, This is thy King and Lawgiver, thy Judge and Saviour, and every spirit, seed, motion, or thought, which is contrary, opposeth, or riseth against the life of this pure, righteous, precious Seed, (wheresoever or in whomsoever it is, or appeareth,) is of antichrist, which the Lord God will consume by the Spirit of his mouth, and destroy by the brightness of his coming, (without respect

of persons,) and this hath been the testimony of the servants of the Lord in ages past, and this hath been, and is, our testimony, (who are his servants,) unto the world in this age, which work he is now cutting short in righteousness, for his Elect Seed's sake, in whom alone, he is well pleased, which has long been pierced, wounded, grieved, and oppressed, by the contrary seed of evil doers, which has always opposed and exalted itself, above all that is called God, and would not, that HE should reign, (who is the truth, the resurrection, and the life,) *whose right alone it is, and for whose sake*, the Lord God Almighty will overturn, overturn, overturn, till he possesses it. unto the ends of the earth."—pages 347, 348.

CHAPTER VII.

Remarks upon the Quotations made by the Compilers from the writings of
 GEORGE FOX.

This eminent minister and servant of Jesus Christ, was the honourable instrument, whom it pleased the Lord to make use of, in the convincement and gathering of the first members of the Society of Friends. He descended from a respectable family in Leicestershire, and his parents being persons of a religious character, endeavoured to give him, as well as the rest of their children, a guarded and pious education, according to the established religion of the nation. His opportunities of literary instruction were very limited, and hence his manner of writing is sometimes ambiguous and rather unpolished, but being naturally of a sound understanding and vigorous mind, and deeply versed in that knowledge, which is only to be acquired in the school of Christ, he became an eminent preacher of the gospel of Life and Salvation, skilful both in word and doctrine.

It pleased the Lord very early in life, to impress upon his mind, the great fundamental doctrines of the Christian Religion, and to give him a clearer and more spiritual view of the nature of the gospel dispensation, than was then known by the different denominations of professors.

In speaking of these divine openings into the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, which were graciously vouchsafed to him, he informs us, that although they were not always communicated to him, through the medium of the sacred volume, yet they all answered to the testimonies of Holy Scripture, and were in accordance with it.

Soon after his mind came under religious exercise, he was brought to see, and reverently to acknowledge the unspeakable mercy of God in giving his dear Son, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to be a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world; and when questioned on this subject by Nathaniel Stevens, he gave a remarkably clear and full testimony to his belief in the atonement, which he has recorded in his Journal, p. 86.

His writings are remarkable for the abundant testimony which they bear, to the Divinity and various offices of our blessed Lord, and although the state of the Christian world at that time required that the doctrine of his second coming, by his Holy Spirit in the souls of all mankind, should be peculiarly enforced, yet he was ever careful to give, when occasion demanded, his unequivocal and positive declaration, to the unspeakable blessings which flowed from his transcendent manifestation in the body of flesh.

In the year 1673, being in the island of Barbadoes, and many

misrepresentations of the Society of Friends being then circulated there, with the design of rendering them odious in the estimation of the people, he addressed a letter to the Governor and Council, in which he makes a full confession of the belief of the early Quakers, in God, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Scriptures; for which see the conclusion of this chapter, and page 147 of the second volume of his Journal. In 1682 he issued a pamphlet, entitled, "Something by way of answer to all such as falsely say, the Quakers are no christians," which contains a declaration of the belief of the Society, in the Holy Three which bear record in heaven, the Divinity and Atonement of Jesus Christ, and the authenticity and divine authority of Holy Scripture.

George Fox died in the year 1690, and as we have these two declarations of the soundness of his faith, together with that to priest Stevens in 1644, they alone, if we had no other proof, (though there are volumes beside,) are amply sufficient, to show in the most indubitable manner, that he was not a believer in the antichristian notions of Elias Hicks. If, therefore, the compilers had been able to adduce from his controversial writings, any passages which could be misconstrued to favour a contrary opinion, it would not be any evidence of his coinciding in the sentiments which they wish to force upon him, unless they could make it appear that he denied at one time what he solemnly professed at another; and if they could do this, the authority of such a man would be of little moment. But George Fox was too deeply versed in the sacred truths of christian redemption, and too largely experienced in the work of salvation, to evince so changeable a disposition, or to entertain a doubt of any of the doctrines of the gospel of Christ. His religion was of the heart, not of the head. He had tasted, and handled, of the good Word of life, and spake from experimental knowledge of that salvation, which was purchased for mankind, by the coming, and suffering, and death of the adorable Son of God.

Most of the extracts made by the compilers, are taken from two controversial books by George Fox, entitled "Saul's Errand to Damascus," and the "Great Mystery," &c. Both of the books are so badly printed, as to render their authority, in many places, doubtful; they have now become scarce, and are accessible to but few of the members of the Society of Friends. It would seem that the compilers have not considered George Fox as very good authority for their principles, since their extracts from his works, are generally very short, several of them greatly mutilated, and taken from pieces, by no means so fully declaratory of his faith, as other essays which he wrote; particularly some inserted in his Journal. Some of the passages quoted in the pamphlet, are such as the enemies of Friends adduced, in order to prove that he was not a christian; a circumstance by no means favourable to the cause in which the compilers have embarked.

We shall now proceed to an examination of the quotations of the compilers, and trust we shall be able to show, that in all they have gleaned from him, there is nothing which will support the antichristian dogmas of Elias Hicks. The first extract on page 46 of

the pamphlet, is from an essay, entitled "Saul's Errand to Damascus," page 12, viz :

☞ [" Question, Whether a believer be justified by Christ's righteousness, imputed—Yea or No ?

" Answer, He that believeth is born of God ; and he that is born of God is justified *by Christ alone*, without imputation."] ☞

Our present business is only to inquire how far the sentiments here expressed by George Fox, accord with those of Elias Hicks upon the same subject. George Fox says, " he that is born of God is justified by Christ alone without imputation." Now if the believer " is justified by Christ *alone*," it is evident, he is not justified by any works of his own, but by Christ's righteousness; and whether we say this righteousness is imputed, applied, or put on, all which terms the scriptures warrant, the doctrine is the same, the expression changes it not. The meaning of George Fox, therefore, is simply this, that the believer is made righteous, by and in Christ, which is strictly accordant with that declaration of the apostle Paul, concerning Christ, where he says, " who of God, is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification and redemption ;" and again, " For he hath made him to be sin, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God, *in him*." This doctrine, Elias Hicks rejects in his letter to Dr. Shoemaker, in terms of the strongest disapprobation and contempt. The early Quakers objected to the term *imputation*, in the sense in which it was almost wholly used in that day, viz. the accounting of wicked persons holy, while they continued in their sins; but though they denied this as a most dangerous and delusive doctrine, yet they sincerely owned that imputation which the Holy Scriptures so clearly sets forth. The remaining part of the quotation is from page 14 of the same book, viz.—

☞ [" Question—Whether Christ in the flesh be a figure or not, and if a figure, how and in what? Answer—Christ is the substance of all figures; and his flesh is a figure, for every one passeth through the same way, as he did, who comes to know Christ in the flesh: there must be a suffering with him, before there be a rejoicing with him; Christ is an example to all to walk after: and if thou knewest what an example is, thou wouldst know what a figure is, to come up to the same fulness."] ☞—Page 14.

The reply of George Fox to the proposed question, is divided into two parts: the query is, " whether *Christ in the flesh*, be a figure or not?" To this he plainly replies, " that Christ is the substance of all figures;" therefore it follows, that Christ in the flesh was not a figure, but the substance typified by the figures. He then adds, " Christ's *flesh* is a figure."

It is evident that George Fox uses the word figure here, as synonymous with example; for he says, " Christ is an example, to all to walk after, and if thou *knewest what an example is, thou would know what a figure is*." He was very far, however, from considering that Christ, or his sufferings, in the flesh, was no more than a figure; for on page 98 of his Great Mystery, we find him thus severely reprimanding a priest for saying so: viz.

“And he saith, Christ in the flesh, his sufferings, was but an example and a figure.”

“Answer—Christ ended all figures, in suffering, and examples and patterns; yet he is the saint’s pattern and example, as the Scripture witnesses; and there is no other example nor pattern to be heeded, but Christ alone, which they are to learn of; but to say *he is nothing but a figure*, for that, thou and you all *will be judged*: for he ended all figures, and is the resurrection and the life both; and thy dead body shall live with my dead body, this is scripture; and they that said, the resurrection was past in the days of the apostles, overthrew the faith of some.” The latter part of this was in reply to the charge of denying the resurrection; and George Fox proceeds to answer some other charges alleged, as denying Christ came in the flesh, &c. in which he very justly asserts his belief in the divinity of Jesus Christ.

In consequence of the use of the expression which the compilers have italicised, viz. “Christ’s flesh is a figure,” the enemies of the Society of Friends took occasion to misrepresent them, as though they considered the outward manifestation of our blessed Lord to be nothing more than a figure or type of his inward appearance in the soul of man. This accusation, (now revived by the compilers,) was alleged by Francis Bugg, the author of the Snake, George Keith, and others:—the following reply to the Snake, by George Whitehead, will fully vindicate the early Quakers from the aspersion. In repelling the accusation that they used the words, “figure and veil,” in order to derogate from the true value of Christ’s outward appearance; he alludes to the use of the word *veil* by the apostle Paul in the Hebrews; and then says—

“But herein he [the accuser,] would place on me a misapplication of the words, ‘Who being found in the shape or figure of a man,’ &c. and therefore saith, ‘What relation has this, to the calling ‘Christ Jesus a type or figure of their light within, which I have shown above, out of the Quaker’s books?’ And I have *denied this as a falsehood* before, and now declare against his manifest perversion and injury to me, and my words herein: For as I sincerely *disown* the words charged, viz. “the calling Christ Jesus a type or figure of our light within,” so I could not apply the words before, in the text, Philip. ii. to have any relation thereto, and much less as proof of that, which I never hold: And *I know none of us*, that doth so call Jesus Christ, a type of our light within; HE being the *fountain* thereof; nor that *Christ is only* a figure, as falsely charged by Francis Bugg. Which *perversion*, so far as I can find, was first *forged* from these words in the book, “Saul’s Errand,” viz. ‘Christ in the flesh, without them is their example or figure; which is both one.’ For his being their example, 1 Pet. ii. 21, iv. 1. i. 15, John xiii. 15, are quoted. See also Luke ii. 31. He was called a sign; now hence to say he was *only* a sign, were a *gross perversion*; Christ was our *example*, now hence to say he is *nothing else* but an example, were *an abuse*, and to lessen his dignity, and a *variation from the sense*; as our *adversary has done*, upon trust of his author Francis Bugg; upon his false report, which is *besides all justice, morality, and judicial proceed-*

ings. Now the question is, whether *figure* may be made synonymous to *example*, for the words *example* or *figure* as before? I conceive it may."

George Whitehead then proceeds to give examples, where the Greek word for *type* or *figure*, is also rendered *example*. He then concludes: "That is, *exemplum, exemplar*, hath a threefold signification in scripture: First, it signifies a *type or figure* of things, either past or to come. Second, an example of imitation. Third, an example of warning or caution.

"Now see how synonymously the terms *type, figure, pattern, and example*, are rendered in scripture, and of what extent, not only in relation to the types under the law, but in *some respect* to Christ, and his ministers, though he be also confessed to be the *antitype, substance, and end*, of all legal shadows, types, and figures. But I have not called Christ himself a type of our light within, nor justified the same."—Page 502, *Switch and Supplement*.

It must be evident to every unprejudiced reader, from this explanation of George Whitehead's, that our early Friends used the terms *figure*, and *example*, in much the same sense, when applied to Christ, and that they had no intention whatever of *limiting him to be no more than a figure or example*.

The next quotation from this author, inserted in the pamphlet, is extracted from his *Great Mystery*, page 307. He is replying to John Stillom, who affirmed, "Not any man knows him, speaking of Christ, to be God, till he find him in scripture, and saith, as deep things as the spirit hath revealed, they are all in the scripture."—George Fox answers, "Many knew God and knew Christ, and yet had not written scripture to tell them of those things, as Enoch and Abel; and many again hath scripture, speaking of God and Christ, and yet doth not know God and Christ, and doth not find him in scripture: as instance, [the Pharisees knew not God and Christ, which had the scripture, and had not life until they came to Christ, the scripture speaks of: and many things the spirit did reveal, which was not written in the scriptures;] and was spoken to the saints."—*Great Mystery*, page 306.

It will be seen, that even in this short quotation, the compilers have mutilated the sentence. They begin after a comma, leaving out the leading part of the paragraph, where George Fox has laid down his proposition, and merely take in a part of the example, which he gives, of the truth of his assertion. This they close at a comma, and italicise the last seven words, in order to make it appear that George Fox thought the spirit would reveal many things, which are not declared in the scripture, and thus produce his authority for *pretended new revelations*, which contradict and overturn the sacred volume. That George Fox intended no such thing is very clear. He is speaking of the days of Christ's personal appearance, when the books of the New Testament were not written, and uses the past tense, viz. many things which were not then written, confining it to that time of which he was then speaking; adding that these things, "*was spoken to the saints*." If these things, which were spoken to the saints, had not

been written in the New Testament, George Fox could not have known that they were so spoken; so that it is evident he was alluding to the history, precepts, and doctrine, which were then spoken to the saints, and written in the New Testament. The compilers were aware, no doubt, that these last six words would destroy the construction which they wished to force upon his expression, and have, therefore, omitted them. To show that George Fox had no slight esteem of the sacred volume, we shall subjoin the following short extract from the same work. Samuel Eaton objected, "The devil shows his spite and spleen, in them who say they have the Word, as it was in the beginning, against the scriptures," &c.

George Fox. "Answer.—That is not so, for *they that have the Word*, as was in the beginning, *own the scriptures*, and are not against them, but are in that which fulfils them."—Great Mystery, page 4.

Hence, it is clear, that they who *do not* own the scriptures, but are opposed to them, and preach doctrines contrary to them, and refuse to have their doctrines tried by them, have not that Word which was in the beginning. Again, in his answer to Enoch Howett, who made the scriptures "to be the *only weapon* whereby Christ overthrew the devil." George Fox said—

"Who (Christ) bruise his head, and was before scripture was; yet the scriptures is for correction and doctrine, furnishing the man of God in his place; and Christ, the Seed, was before scripture was: and all them that hath scripture, and not Christ, cannot overcome the devil, you and the papists doing his work; for they that overcome him, it is with the power, and those have the scriptures of truth, which the devil is out of."—Pages 14, 15.

The remainder of the quotation, on page 55 of the pamphlet, is from George Fox's reply to Ambrose Dickinson, who asserted that "there is no knowledge of Christ, in this generation, but by the scripture." Answer. ¶ "Many may have the scriptures, and not know Christ; they will not give the knowledge of Christ; that which comes from him and shines in the heart, doth give the knowledge of Christ, the Light. And the Jews had the scriptures, but had not the knowledge of Christ,] ¶ as you that doth not know the light, that doth enlighten every man that cometh into the world, the ear being stopped to that of God in you, and eyes closed; and it is not the spirit; and the letter of it cannot give life."—Page 245.

Here again the compilers close at a comma, taking in only thirteen words of a sentence beginning after a period, which they have changed to a comma, and omitted the conjunction "and." Although these alterations do not change the sense, yet they serve to show the liberties which the compilers take with the text. It is obvious that George Fox says nothing in this quotation which lessens the value or authority of Holy Scripture. He simply states a fact which history has recorded, and which the experience of every day confirms, viz. that men may abuse the choicest blessings of heaven, and thus deprive themselves of the inestimable advantages which Divine Providence has designed for them. The scriptures will not give the knowledge of Christ, unless they are read under the sacred influence

of his spirit, and then, the Apostle declares, they are able to make wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

At the bottom of pages 55, 56, of the pamphlet, about four lines are inserted, which the compilers have taken out of the following replies of George Fox to the assertion of Thomas Leadger, viz.

"T. L.—The scripture is the lanthorn of obedience, and it directs men to Jesus, and ne calls the scripture, *the word of God*, the sum of truth; and they could not have known there had been a Christ, or a Mediator, or grace, or glory, or worship, or Father, or Spirit, or Light, but as it is declared in scripture."

"Answer.—I do believe you, who are got up since the days of the Apostles, in the apostacy, inwardly ravening from the spirit of God; you had not known there had been a Father, or Spirit, or grace, or worship, if the scripture had not declared it; but [they that had not scripture, had faith, had the Holy Ghost, had the Father, knew the Father, knew Christ, knew the Spirit,] they that had the scripture, *the Pharisees*, knew not the Father, knew not the Holy Ghost, nor the Redeemer, but resisted, (as it was in Stephen,) knew not Father, nor Christ, the author of it, [scripture,] knew not him that was born of the Spirit." George Fox proceeds to state that those who had the scriptures, and obeyed the Light of Christ, came to know all these mysteries of redemption, while the Pharisees, though they had the scriptures, yet, refusing to come to Christ, were not profited by them. He then takes up Thomas Leadger's next assertion, viz.

T. L.—The gospel is the scripture.

G. F.—"Answer. [Many may have the scripture, and deny the power of God, which is the gospel,] many had the scripture and the form, and stood against the Son of Truth, Christ Jesus, the power of God, the gospel; and as for thy other lies and slanders, which are not worth mentioning, which comes from thy drunken spirit, when the spirit is awakened that suffers by it, thou shalt feel every word of thy own, thy burthen, and thou that doth set the scriptures above Christ, and God, and the Spirit, art a heathen."—Pages 256, 257.

The reader will observe by the brackets marked with a hand, that the compilers have mutilated the replies of George Fox. Although his style is here somewhat ambiguous, yet there is no difficulty in understanding his real meaning. He is informing those who *denied* the revelation of the Holy Spirit in the soul, that the scriptures without this, will not bring them to the saving knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. In his reply to the first assertion he gives full proof how highly he valued the sacred writings, calling them the words of God, given forth by the Holy Ghost. That he is far from lessening or disesteeming the Holy Scripture, will appear from the following quotations.

Richard Baxter, writing against Friends, called the scriptures "the temporal word;" to which George Fox replies. "Now see if this be not an undervaluing the scriptures of truth, and *the words of God and Christ, and the prophets and apostles, which cannot be bro-*

ken: he calls it a *temporal word*, which the scripture teacheth no such doctrine, but thy lying spirit."—Page 29.

Again, in reply to some who objected that "for people to be led by a light within, is to make the scriptures useless." He says, "No, this lets [us] see the scriptures in their place, and the fulfilling of them, which was *given forth to be believed, practised, read and fulfilled*, not for men to make a trade of them, and call people from the light within, with which they should see the scriptures; and none comes into covenant with God, with their hearts and their minds; that they need not say, one to another, know the Lord, that they may be always living under man's teaching."—Page 74.

On page 122, he says, "*Whoever owns the Word of God*, that reconciles to the Father, and hammers down, and brings out of the fall, and cuts down and burns up; they must know their salvation wrought out with fear and trembling: and these *owns the word of God, and the words of God the scriptures*; and these owns this trembling."

He says, "Christ's name is called the Word of God; his name is above every name, and over all things he must have the pre-eminence, words and names. *Yet I say, the scriptures of truth, given forth from the spirit of truth, are the words of God: God's words*, which Christ, the Word, fulfilled by him, in whom they end, who was before the words were spoken forth."—Page 110.

The next quotation from G. Fox, is from page 217, of his "Great Mystery." An opponent of the early Quakers, had written a book railing against their doctrines and principles; among other charges which he alleged against them, was this—"To say Christ is within, is never to mention Christ without." To this unjust accusation, G. Fox replies in these strong terms—[“There's none knows *Christ within*, but he *knows him without*; the same yesterday, to-day, and forever; and there's none knows him but they know him *within*, revealed of the Father, which is beyond flesh and blood.”]

It appears that this opponent, suspected the early Quakers of what Elias Hicks, now openly acknowledges to be his doctrine, both in his letters and preaching; and to this suspicion G. Fox replies, that none know Christ within; none come to the revelation of the Holy Spirit, but they know and acknowledge him without also, and this not by human testimony, or merely because it is declared by another, but by the revelation of the Father's Spirit within them. It would seem very clear from this, that those who deny Christ without, cannot truly know and acknowledge him within. G. Fox was far from denying the outward manifestation of our blessed Lord, or his death upon the cross, as will be seen by the following extracts from this book. In reply to one who asserted "that *every man* in the world, should not have his sins pardoned"—he replies:

"Christ gave himself, his body, for the life of the whole world; he was the offering for the sins of the whole world; and paid the debt, and made satisfaction; and doth enlighten every man that comes into the world, that all, through him, might believe; AND HE THAT DOETH NOT BELIEVE IN THE OFFERING, IS CONDEMNED ALREADY."—Page 63. What would G. Fox have said to the unqualified and

bold denial of belief in that most precious offering, which Elias Hicks has so often deliberately made, in his letters and preaching? "*he that doth not believe in the offering, is condemned already.*"

On page 72, he says, "Reprobates may talk of justification: *did not Christ work justification, without them, upon the earth, for mankind, and brought righteousness?* And where there is Christ made manifest within, is not their justification wrought there from Heaven, within? Where faith is witnessed within, doth not that justify? And none knows justification in truth, *but where it is wrought within.*"

In reply to one, who said "Christ was a sinner by imputation," he remarks—"The Scripture doth not speak such kind of words; but that he knew no sin; no guile was found in his mouth: a Lamb without spot or blemish, though *it pleased the Father to lay the iniquity upon him*; by his stripes we are healed. And by *the one offering* [he] *perfected forever, them that are sanctified; made himself an offering for the sins of the whole world*; who breaks down the partition wall betwixt Jews and Gentiles, slays the enmity among men, reconciles in one, unto the Father *by his body, his death upon the cross.*"—page 158.

We have next about a line and a half, quoted from the commencement of a paragraph of considerable length, in which G. Fox asserts that none can come savingly to witness the sufferings of Christ, but through obedience to the Holy Spirit within. The compilers have done him great injustice, by closing their quotation at a semicolon, and excluding the explanation which he gives of his meaning. The part inserted in the pamphlet is enclosed in brackets, with a hand, viz:

☞["There is none knows Christ nor his suffering, but with the "Spirit of God within;"] ☞ for *with the Spirit of God in the prophets, and the holy men, they knew Christ that was to come to suffer; with the Spirit of God in the apostles, they knew that was the Christ, that did suffer; with the same Spirit of God within people, they now come to see him, and enjoy him, and receive him, the same that did suffer, which none doth, that are out of the Spirit. And the Pharisees that had scriptures, knew him not, who were gone astray from the Spirit; nor the gentiles though they had scriptures; neither doth the apostates who are inwardly ravened from the Spirit of God, though they have all the sheep's clothing, know the light that doth enlighten every man that cometh into the world, though they be for multitude as the sands on the sea shore; nor doth any know it, and receive it, but who comes to that which they ravened from.*"—page 142.

It must be apparent to every reader, that the compilers have mutilated their quotation, in order to make G. Fox inculcate the idea that there was no offering for sin, but in the soul of man. This was certainly very unfair, since in the same sentence, he acknowledges that the prophets, under the influence of the Holy Ghost, prophesied of Christ that was *to come to suffer*, that when he came, the apostles were convinced by the *same spirit*, that it was he who had been prophesied of, *that did suffer*, and that those who have this spirit *now*, come to see and enjoy him. This is so far from a denial of

the outward offering of Jesus Christ, that it is asserting it upon the highest authority and sanction; and plainly implies that all those who have not come to see and enjoy him, who so suffered, cannot have that Holy Spirit, which led the prophets to foretel his coming.

We have next, two short quotations from the same work, upon the subject of the scriptures, in which G. Fox asserts, that the spirit and life, are not in the scriptures, but were in them that gave the scripture forth. In the same paragraph from which this is taken, the author asserts that *they are the words of God*. As God's words cannot contradict each other, but must always be in accordance, it is manifest that every thing which contradicts the testimony of the sacred volume, must proceed from that spirit which opposes God's words, and is at enmity with him.

On page 67, of the pamphlet, we are presented with an extract, from an essay by G. Fox, entitled "A testimony concerning the Blood of the Old Covenant, and the Blood of the New Covenant," &c. : inserted in his doctrinals, page 643 and seq. The quotation as made by the compilers is very far from giving us the true sense of G. Fox, upon this very important subject. They have omitted all the first part of the essay, containing a description of the blood shed under the law, and the precious blood of Christ which he freely poured out for the sins of the whole world. But after the many proofs we have had of the partiality and injustice of the compilers, we could not expect them to extend their extract further, as it would completely have contradicted the favourite notions of Elias Hicks; to support which, they seem fully prepared to sacrifice all principles of fair and honourable quotation.

We shall now permit G. Fox to speak for himself, and the reader will have an opportunity of observing the nature of the doctrine contained in the suppressed parts. The compilers' extract is enclosed in brackets, with a hand.

The writer commences his essay, with describing the manner of sprinkling the blood of the sacrifices under the law, which blood could not take away sin. "But, says he, in the new covenant it is written, Forasmuch as we are not redeemed with corruptible things, nor with silver nor gold, from our vain conversations, or tradition of our forefathers, but with the precious blood of Christ, a Lamb without blemish or spot, which Lamb was *foreordained* before the foundation of the world, and was manifested in the *Apostles' time and days*, which he calls the last times. Silver and gold are corruptible things, which cannot redeem from corruption, nor the blood of bulls, goats, or other creatures which will corrupt, but the blood of the Lamb, which was ordained before the foundation of the world, and manifested in the last times, in the new covenant; this precious blood of the Lamb, without spot or blemish, Christ Jesus, doth not corrupt, for it doth redeem from the traditions of our forefathers, the Jews, in the old covenant, and the corruptible blood of bulls, goats, and other creatures, that could not take away sin. And so by the blood of the Lamb, Christ Jesus, the saints are redeemed

from their vain conversation and corruptible life, to a conversation in Heaven, and incorruptible life.

“ And as Moses in the old covenant sprinkled the people with the blood, the life of beasts; so Christ, our High Priest, sprinkles the hearts and consciences of his people, in the new covenant, with his blood, his life, from their dead works, that they may serve the living God, in newness of life: And as the blood of the old covenant was the life of the beasts, so the blood of the everlasting covenant, is the life of Christ the Lamb, *ordained before the foundation of the world*, who is the great Shepherd of his sheep; through the blood of his everlasting covenant, he makes his saints perfect in every good work, to do his will, working in them that which is well pleasing in his sight.

“ So it is clear, the blood of the everlasting new covenant, is the life of Christ Jesus; and the blood of the old covenant was the life of the beasts, and the bodies of those beasts in the old covenant were burnt without the Jews’ camp, and the blood was brought into the sanctuary by the High Priest, as an atonement for the sins of the priests and people; *wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify his people with his own blood, suffered without the gates of Jerusalem*: let us go, therefore, unto him, (to wit, Christ,) without the Jews’ camp, bearing Christ’s reproach, who was reproached, who sanctifies with his blood, his life, which dedicates the new covenant; so that all may come to Jesus, the *Me-li-ator* of the new covenant, and his blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than that of Abel, or of the blood of bulls and goats, the life of beasts; for Christ being a High Priest, and of a more perfect tabernacle than that which was made with hands, in the old covenant, did not enter into the holy place made with hands, by the blood of bulls, goats, and calves, as the priests of the old covenant did. But Christ, the Lamb of God, *ordained before the foundation of the world, which was manifested in time*, by his own blood, his life, entered once into the holy place, into heaven itself (*now to appear in the presence of God for us*.) *having obtained* eternal redemption for us: so it is the blood, the life of Christ, in the new covenant, that cleanseth from all sin, who through *the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God*, to purge our consciences from dead works, to serve the living God: for this cause *he is the Me-li-ator* of the New Testament.

“ And so Christ was *once offered for sin, who tasted death for every man*; so he takes away the first covenant, that he may establish the second, *and by one offering he hath perfected forever, them that are sanctified*; so it is by the blood of Christ, by which all his people’s sins are washed away, who did, and do confess, that Christ had redeemed them to God by his blood, and their garments were made white with the blood of the Lamb.

“ So [the blood of the old covenant, was the life of the beasts and other creatures, and the blood of the new covenant, is the life of Christ Jesus, who saith, except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood, ye have no life in you, John vi. 53. So the blood of the new covenant, is not according to the old; and so with this blood of the new covenant, must every one feel their hearts sprinkled if

“ they have life ; and in this new covenant, they shall all know the Lord, &c. And by this blood of Jesus, his life, in the new covenant, they are justified, *in whom* we have redemption, and the forgiveness of sins ; and Christ hath purchased his Church with his own blood, his life, and their faith doth stand in his blood, which is the life of the Lamb.] Therefore the apostle saith, if ye walk in the light, as HE is in the light, then have ye fellowship one with another, and the blood of Christ Jesus, His Son, cleanses from all sin.

“ So it is not the blood of bulls, goats, or the blood of other creatures, which was the blood of the old covenant, nor their outward washings in it, that takes away sin ; but the blood of the new covenant, which is the blood of the Lamb without blemish, Christ Jesus, the blood of the Lamb, the Life of the Lamb, with which Christ, the High Priest, sanctifies, cleanses, and redeems ; and he washes with his own life, his blood, yea he sprinkles the altar of their hearts that they may offer a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruits of our lips, giving thanks to his name.

“ So you are *bought and purchased* with the blood of Christ, the life of Christ, *who has died for you*, and *risen* for your justification, that all might live to him, and not to themselves, and glorify HIM, in body, soul, and spirit, which are his, who hath *purchased* you with his blood, his life ; so *worthy is the Lamb, to receive glory and honour*, who hath redeemed us to God by his blood, and hath washed us from our sins by his blood, and our garments are made white by the blood of the Lamb. So the saints do overcome by the blood, the life of the Lamb, *who was dead, and is alive again, and lives forevermore.*”—Pages 643, 644, 645.

The reader will perceive how far George Fox is from denying, or slighting, that most acceptable sacrifice of Christ's body upon the cross. He acknowledges Jesus Christ to have been fore-ordained before the foundation of the world, and manifested in the apostles' times ; that HE offered himself up without the gates of Jerusalem, a Lamb without spot unto God, an offering for the sins of the whole world, tasting death therein for every man. Now Elias Hicks denies that he was sent into the world to suffer death, or that he made atonement for any sins but the legal sins of the Jews. He calls the doctrine of propitiation and atonement, which George Fox has so beautifully set forth in this essay, an outrage against every righteous law of God and man. He rejects the very principle of atonement, terming it wicked and absurd ; and denounces all those who would be willing to accept the forgiveness of their sin thereby, as “bold and daring,” destitute of “any right sense of justice or mercy,” and standing “in direct opposition to every principle of justice and honesty, of mercy and love.” What “a poor selfish creature, and how unworthy of notice” does Elias Hicks thus make George Fox to have been.

In the next two quotations, on page 68 of the pamphlet, the compilers have acted with no greater justice toward George Fox. They have mutilated their extracts, so as to make them convey a meaning directly the reverse of what George Fox has fully declared in the

same essay. They are taken from his "Answer to the declaration of the great Turk." To render the intentions of the compilers more clearly apparent, we enclose their quotations in brackets, and insert all the intermediate matter which they have unfairly omitted, viz.

[“ Now whereas the Emperor of the Turks saith, that he is “ commander and guardian of the christians’ crucified God. Now in “ this he is mistaken, for the eternal, incomprehensible, invisible, “ everlasting God; whose divinity extends throughout the whole “ earth, who is God in heaven above, and in the earth beneath, to “ whom all nations are but as the drop of a bucket; this is the true “ christians’ God, whom they serve and worship, in his spirit and “ truth, which the Jews did not crucify, nor could they crucify: “ and it is blasphemy for the Jews, or any, to say, that they did “ crucify the true christians’ eternal, invisible God; and great igno- “ ed,] or that the eternal, incomprehensible, immortal God, the creator of all, who is the God of the spirits of all flesh, and the breath of all mankind is in his power, so that poor mortals or externals should say, think, or imagine, that the eternal, invisible, everlasting, immortal, incomprehensible God, was or can be crucified, which they cannot comprehend, which is the true christians’ God.

“ But Christ, which was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh, who took not upon him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham; *he suffered for us in the flesh.* And so as Christ also *hath once suffered for sins in the flesh; he, the just for the unjust,* that Christ might bring us to God, so God was not crucified, but Christ, being put to death, or crucified in the flesh, but quickened again in the spirit, and rose again; *and sits at the right hand of God;* this Peter, (one of the apostles of Jesus,) *testifieth, and the true christians now believe it:* and though Christ was crucified through weakness, that is through the flesh, yet he is alive and liveth by the power of God, 2 Corinth. xiii.

“ So it is clear that the eternal and invisible, incomprehensible God was not, nor cannot be crucified; but Christ, the Son of God, *suffered* according to the flesh, not in his Godhead: *So Christ died for our sins,* according to the scripture of the Old and New Testament; *for as in Adam all died, so even in Christ shall all be made alive;* and that Christ by the grace of God, *should taste death for every man:* so it was not the invisible, eternal, incomprehensible God, that was crucified and died, and did taste death for every man, but Christ according to the flesh, who was *manifest to take away our sin;* and in him there was no sin; so Christ was manifest to destroy the works of the devil, and Christ *through his death,* destroys death, *that sin brought, and the devil,* the power of death. And about the ninth hour, (when Jesus Christ hanged upon the cross,) he cried with a loud voice, saying, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me.* So it is clear the eternal God did not die, nor was crucified, but Christ was put to death in the flesh; this testifies Matthew, one of Christ’s apostles: *So he was the one offering,* who made an end of all the offerings among the Jews, through *the offering up of the body of Jesus once for all:* so the man Christ Jesus *offered up*

himself, one sacrifice for sins; so by that one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified; so he is the propitiation, offering, and sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, yea, Jesus Christ which was of the seed of David: and so according to the scripture, Christ died for our sins, and he was buried and rose again the third day according to the scriptures; and after he was risen from the dead, he was seen of the apostles; and again he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once, that were believers in him; and this was after he was dead, buried, and risen: but none of the princes of the world knew him, for had they known Christ, they would not have crucified him; but we know now, that Christ being raised from the dead, dies no more, and death hath no more dominion over Christ, in that he died unto sin, and for the sins of the whole world; but now he being raised from the dead he is set at the right hand of God; and therefore [Jesus of Nazareth, a man, approved of God, by miracles, wonders, and signs which God did by him, “this Jesus, the son of Mary, the Jews with their wicked hands did “take, crucify, and slay;] but it was God, who loosed the pangs of death, because it was not possible, that he should be holden of it: and though the Jews did crucify Jesus, and slew him, and hanged him on a tree; yet God hath raised him up the third day, and God hath exalted him at his right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance, &c. and forgiveness of sins; so Christ’s apostles were witnesses, how God raised him from the dead; so you may see here, it was not God that was crucified and died, for he raised Christ from the dead, on the third day, and showed him openly to his apostles, and they did eat and drink with Jesus Christ, after that God had raised him up from the dead; and he commanded his apostles to preach to the people, and testify that it was he, that was ordained of God, to be judge of the quick and dead; and to him gave all the prophets, (and apostles,) of God witness, that through the name of Jesus, whosoever believed in him should receive remission of sins, neither is there salvation in any other: for there is no other name under heaven, given amongst men, whereby we must be saved, but by Jesus of Nazareth, whom the Jews crucified; whom God hath raised from the dead; for God said to David, that of the fruit of his loins, (according to the flesh,) God would raise up Christ to sit on his throne.

“And David, he seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither did his flesh see corruption. So, though the Jews crucified him, and a soldier thrust a spear into his side; and though he was crucified and hanged on a tree, and slain, dead, and buried. Him did God raise up the third day, and he appeared to his apostles and disciples, and did eat and drink with them after he was risen, who were the faithful witnesses that God raised him up from the dead; who is ascended up into heaven, at the right hand of God; who being the brightness of God’s glory, and the express image of his substance, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high, whom the heavens must receive, until the time of the restitution of all things,

which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began; and he that descended, is the same also that ascended, far above all heavens, that he might fill all things, who led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men, &c.

“And we have redemption through Christ’s blood, even forgiveness of our sins, who hath delivered us *from the devil*, (the power of darkness,) *who is the Seed of the woman*, which bruisseth the old serpent’s head, which deceived Adam and Eve; which God promised to Adam, that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent’s head; *in which Seed, viz. Christ, all nations* are blessed, who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature; for by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in the earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, principalities or powers, *all things were created by Him and for Him*, and he was before all things, and by Him all things consist; and Christ saith in his prayer to his Father, this is eternal life, that they might know the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent. And Jesus desired of God his Father, saying, that those whom God hath given him, might be with him, where he was, that they might behold his glory, which God hath given him; for he loved him before the foundation of the world; therefore, saith Christ, Now, Oh! Father, glorify thou me, with thy own self, with the glory which I had with thee, before the world was; and Christ said, to his disciples, after he was risen from the dead, all power, in heaven and in earth, is given unto me; and he bid his disciples go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature, &c. And then, after the Lord Jesus Christ had spoken to his disciples, he *was received up into heaven, and sate down at the right hand of God*.

“And now *we, who are the believers in Christ Jesus, and true Christians*, we do live unto him, and if we die, we die unto the Lord, whether we live or die we are the Lord’s; for this end Christ *both died, revived and rose*, that he might be Lord both of the dead and of the living; and he is *Judge both of quick and dead*, who is the only one *Mediator* betwixt God and man, *even the Man Christ Jesus*, who *makes intercession to God* for his people, and is *able to save to the utmost*, all that come to God by him, who *ever lives to make intercession for them*, who is sate down at the right hand of God in heaven, who is the Prince of the kings of the earth; who said to John, I am the first and the last, I am he that *liveth and was dead*, and behold, I am alive for evermore.”—1006, 1007, 1008.

We have here no indications of doubting, or denying, either the divinity or atonement of the Lord Jesus, or any of his glorious offices in the great work of man’s redemption. From this essay, so fraught with Christian doctrine, the compilers have most unfairly extracted two short and incomplete sentences, and placed them in their pamphlet in such a position, as to make it appear as though the worthy author did not believe in the divinity of the Saviour. They place first, that part where George Fox denies that God was crucified, or could be put to death, and immediately below this introduce these expressions; “Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God, by miracles, wonders and signs, which God did by him; this Jesus, the son

of Mary, the Jews with their wicked hands did take, crucify, and slay ;" here they stop, omitting all the intermediate and succeeding part, in which he asserts the glorious and divine attributes of this same Jesus. In this disjointed situation, separated from all the explanatory matter, with which they are immediately connected in the original, they present an aspect which might induce some readers, who were ignorant of the character of George Fox, to suppose that he considered Jesus Christ no more than a man approved of God ; and it is obvious that such is the impression which the compilers, most unjustly, wish to produce. This design must forcibly strike every ingenuous person who examines their pamphlet, and we doubt not but among those who may even favour the principles which the compilers contend for, there are many, very many, who will turn away with disgust and indignation, at the unmanly artifices which have been resorted to, in order to support the tottering cause of unbelief.

It is not a little curious to observe the great difficulties which the compilers encounter in mustering up some mutilated extracts which may have the semblance of support for Elias Hicks' opinions. Their ingenuity seems to have been put to the rack, especially in the present case. Anxious to grace their book with so dignified a name as that of Fox, they seem resolved to put down something, however irrelevant to the purpose. But after ransacking his controversial papers, mutilating and garbling his sentences and meaning, they do not at last present us with one extract by which a single point of Elias Hicks' unbelief can be supported, while, if George Fox is only permitted to speak out fairly, he totally condemns and rejects as anti-christian, the notions which they so strenuously contend for.

In their next quotation they have taken about four lines out of a paragraph, with the view to prove by it, that George Fox denied the outward offering of Christ ; whereas he wrote the essay from which it is taken, in order to repel " the many lies and false reports which had been cast upon the Quakers, that they do slight, deny, and undervalue the blood of Christ Jesus ;" and although the essay is headed with these words, the compilers have most unjustly adduced the quotation from it, to confirm these " lies and false reports." We shall quote the whole paragraph, and insert the part extracted by the compilers in brackets marked with a hand, viz :

" Thus the first covenant was dedicated with the blood, which was the life of all flesh ; but [the new and second covenant is " dedicated with the blood, the life of Christ Jesus, which is the alone " atonement unto God, by which all his people are washed, sanctified, cleansed, and redeemed to God ;] so that their faith and testimony stands in the blood of the Lamb, the life of Christ Jesus, foreordained before the world was, a Lamb without blemish, guile, spot or sin, which cleanses from all spots and sin, and washes and makes clean the garments. And Christ abolishes both the blood of beasts, and the altar and all the traditions in the law, and their offerings and sacrifices before the law, *by the offering up of himself, once in the end of the world, a Lamb ordained before the foundation of the world, therefore must every one's faith and testimony stand in*

son and his blood. And who are the true witnesses of this, but they only that have drunk of the blood of Christ, and eaten of his flesh, which he gives for the life of the world, not such as talk of it only."—Page 646.

We have here a full confession of faith in the Lamb of God, fore-ordained to take away the sin of the world, and offered up upon the cross, once in the end of the world. How contrary is the irreverent denial of this most precious doctrine, made by Elias Hicks in his letter to Dr. Shoemaker—let the reader contrast them.

The compilers have revived the old objection to George Fox, so much harped upon by the enemies of Friends, that he said he was equal with God. In this they have again identified themselves with Bugg, Keith, and the Snake. The malicious accusations and aspersions of these illiberal opponents having been repeatedly answered, we shall merely quote some passages from the replies; as they will furnish a full defence of the expressions of George Fox. Joseph Wyeth after reciting the charge of the Snake; that George Fox, when before the Justices at the Lancaster Assizes, asserted "that he was equal with God," adds—

"Pray reader observe, had this been true that George Fox had so answered, as the Snake says he did, in the presence of three Justices, what need was there for Marshal and Altan to swear it against him?—Since the Justices, if they had heard it themselves, might have convicted him thereof upon their own personal hearing, without other evidence. Or how likely is it that Colonel West and Thomas Tell, both Justices upon the bench at this trial, should sign a supersedeas, which both of them did, for his acquittal: if either of them had heard him say the words charged? Or how could he have been discharged for want of another evidence, when his adversaries might have brought in the three Justices against him, had it been true, that they had heard him themselves. But besides, there are two lies in this paragraph; the first is, there was not any Justice of the Peace, or Colonel named Tell. Secondly, George Fox did not answer that he was equal with God. But thus it was; there were eight several charges against him; the fourth of which was, that he had said, he was equal with God, which being asked in court, he made the following answer: George Fox, 'That was not so spoken by me: But he that sanctifieth, and he that is sanctified, is all of one, Heb. ii. 11. It is God and Christ that sanctifieth, and the saints are all *one*, in the Father and the Son; they are of his bone and of his flesh—Ephesians v. 30. And the *Father and the Son are one*; and they are the sons of God—Galatians iv. 6. And as they that are joined to the Lord are one spirit, so they that are joined to an harlot, are one flesh, 1st Cor. vi. 16, 17. This the scriptures witnesseth and I witness.' This answer is scriptural, and is directly opposite to what he was then charged with, as it also is, to what the Snake's pamphleteer, says he did then answer."—Switch, page 63.

The Switch for the Snake was published in 1699, and the defence of George Fox, which we have quoted, is quite sufficient to clear him of any design to equal himself, or the saints, with the Almighty Creator

George Whitehead in the Supplement to the Switch, thus replies to the same charge—"Which is also a false charge and quotation against George Fox; who being charged by his persecutors with professing himself to be equal with God, *positively denies* the charge, as not so spoken, as that George Fox was equal with God, but that *the Father and the Son are one*; and that *Christ and the Holy Spirit are equal with God*—Saul's Errand to Damascus, p. 5, 6. See also, Just Enquiry, p. 12."—Page 509.

To George Keith's charge that the Quakers made themselves equal with God; the authors of the "Serious Examination," reply: "This charge is falsely cited; and the words as printed even in 'Saul's Errand,' are *misprinted*, or by some accident defective, being these, viz: 'He that hath the same Spirit that raised up Jesus Christ, is equal with God;' *being not the Quakers' doctrine or principle*, as well as contrary to George Fox's answer to his persecutors, to the matters falsely charged upon him, Saul's Errand, p. 3, his words should be thus rendered, or understood, 'He that hath the same Spirit which raised up Jesus Christ; hath *that* which is equal with God;' as most agreeable to his own answer to his persecutors; who in their petition, charged him with professing and avowing that he was equal with God, which *he positively denied*, in sundry places of Saul's Errand, p. 2, 5, 10, though *now falsely quoted against him*; to which his answer further was; 'But *the Father and the Son are one; I and my Father are one*; and he that sanctifieth, and they that are sanctified, are all of one, and they that are joined to the Lord are one Spirit, p. 6, for the same Spirit, where it is, is equal with God.'" There's one 'is' again lacking in the impression; (Note, the said 'Saul's Errand' was printed in 1654, and not so well and carefully as it should have been, and so were divers others by Giles Calvert, in those early days,) and being equal with God, is ascribed to Christ, Phil. ii. 6, *and no otherwise intended*, though misplaced as before; and *not that they* (the Quakers) *ascribe it to themselves, as falsely charged*.

"The matter appears plain, being impartially compared, that the equality intended, *is not between man and his Maker, but between God and his Holy Spirit, between the Father and the Son*. Besides, the people called Quakers, are fully cleared in this point from any such pretence of equality with their Maker; but that they are partakers of his Spirit, and of the divine nature and image, as is fully answered by George Whitehead, in his 'Antidote against the venom of the Snake in the Grass, page 25, &c.'—page 9, 10.

The reply of G. Fox, to the charge that he was as upright as Christ, contains nothing in it that can be construed as equalling himself with our blessed Lord, though the compilers seem to have quoted it with this view. He says in it, that the saints, are made the righteousness of God; that they are one, in the Father and the Son; and that all the teaching of Christ, is to bring the saints to perfection, even to *that measure* of the stature of the fulness of Christ, which He designs for them.

The following extract, from a declaration of Faith, addressed by George Fox, to the Governor, Council, and Assembly of Barba

does, will completely clear him from the unjust imputation, of coinciding in the antichristian sentiments of Elias Hicks, viz :

“Whereas, many scandalous lies and slanders, have been cast upon us, to render us odious ; as that, we deny God, Christ Jesus, and the Scriptures of Truth, &c. This is to inform you, That all *our books and declarations*, which for these many years have been published to the world, *clearly testify the contrary*. Yet for your satisfaction, we now plainly and sincerely declare—

“That we own and believe, in the Only, Wise, Omnipotent, and Everlasting God, the Creator of all things in Heaven and earth, and the Preserver of all that he hath made ; who is God over all blessed forever, to whom be all honour, glory, dominion, praise, and thanksgiving, both now and for ever more !—

“And we own and believe in Jesus Christ, his beloved, and only begotten Son, in whom he is well pleased, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary ; in whom we have redemption, *through his blood*, even the forgiveness of sins ; who is the express image of the invisible God, the First-Born of every creature ; by whom, were all things created that are in Heaven and in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, dominions, principalities, or powers, all things were created by Him.

“And we own and believe, that *he was made a sacrifice for sin, who knew no sin* ; neither was guile found in his mouth ; that he was *crucified for us, in the flesh, without the gates of Jerusalem* ; and that he was buried and rose again, the third day, by the power of his Father, for our justification, and that he *ascended up into Heaven, and now sitteth at the right hand of God*.

“*This Jesus*, who was the foundation of the holy prophets and apostles, is OUR FOUNDATION ; and we believe, *there is no other foundation*, to be laid, but that which is laid, *even Christ Jesus who tasted death for every man, shed his blood for all men, is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only*, but also for the sins of the whole world : according as John the Baptist testified of Him, when he said, ‘Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world, John i. 29.’

“We believe that *He alone* is our Redeemer and Saviour, the Captain of our Salvation, who saves us from sin, as well as from hell and the wrath to come, and destroys the *Devil* and his works ; *He is the Seed of the woman*, that bruises the serpent’s head, viz : Christ Jesus, the Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last. He is, (as the scriptures of truth say of him,) our wisdom, righteousness, justification and redemption, *neither is there salvation in any other*, for there is no other name under Heaven, given among men, whereby we may be saved. *He alone* is the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls : He is our Prophet whom Moses long since testified of, saying ‘A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, of your brethren like unto me ; Him shall ye hear in all things, whatsoever he shall say unto you : And it shall come to pass that every soul that will not hear that Prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people,’ Acts ii. 22, 23.

“He is now come in spirit, ‘and hath given us an understanding

that we know him that is true.' He rules in our hearts by his law of love and life, and makes us free from the law of sin and death. We have no life, but by him, for $\text{H}\epsilon$ is the quickening Spirit, the second Adam, the Lord from Heaven, by whose blood we are cleansed and our consciences sprinkled from dead works to serve the living God. He is our Mediator, who makes peace and reconciliation, between God, offended, and us, offending, He being the Oath of God, the New Covenant of light, life, grace and peace, the author and finisher of our faith. *This* Lord Jesus Christ, the heavenly *Man*, the Immanuel, God with us, we all own, and believe in; *He whom the High Priest raged against, and said, he had spoken blasphemy, whom the priests and elders of the Jews took counsel together against, and put to death, THE SAME whom Judas betrayed, for thirty pieces of silver, which the priests gave him, as a reward for his treason; who also gave large money to the soldiers, to broach a horrible lie, namely, that his disciples came and stole him away by night, while they slept. After he was risen from the dead, the history of the Acts of the Apostles sets forth, how the chief priests and elders, persecuted the disciples of THIS JESUS, for preaching Christ and his resurrection. This we say, is that Lord Jesus Christ whom we own to be our life and salvation.*

"Concerning the Holy Scriptures; We believe they were given forth by the Holy Spirit of God, through the holy men of God, who, (as the scripture itself declares, 2 Pet. i. 21,) spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; we believe they are to be read, believed, and fulfilled, (he that fulfils them is Christ,) and they are profitable for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works, 2 Tim. iii. 19; and are able to make wise unto salvation, through faith in Christ Jesus. We believe the Holy Scriptures are the words of God, for it is said in Exodus xx. 1., "God spake all these words saying, &c." meaning the ten commandments given forth upon Mount Sinai. And in Rev. xxii. 18., saith John, "I testify to every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man addeth unto these, and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, (not the Word,) &c." So in Luke i. 20, because thou believest not my words; and in John v. 47, xv. 7, xiv. 23, xii. 47: So that we call the Holy Scriptures, as Christ, the Apostles and holy men of God called them, viz: the words of God."—G. Fox's Journal, pages 145, 146, 147.

If there was not to be found in all the writings of G. Fox, any other confession of his christian faith, than that which we have here quoted, it would be amply sufficient to evince in the clearest manner, that so far from coinciding with Elias Hicks in his denial of the doctrines of the gospel of Christ; he was a firm believer in all that is set forth in the Holy Scripture, and especially in those very points, which Elias Hicks rejects, in language so irreverent and contemptuous. The paltry and mutilated scraps which the compilers have extracted from the writings of this honourable Elder, prove nothing in their favour, but on the other hand, serve to show how little they

could find in in his works, which could be manufactured to suit their purpose. The contrast between the doctrines of George Fox and the opinions of Elias Hicks, is too strongly pourtrayed upon every page of his writings, to give the compilers the least hope of securing him as an advocate for their cause. He not only dissents from them, but condemns their principles in the strongest terms.

George Fox was a man of solid religious experience, firmly grounded in the christian religion, and by no means changeable in his disposition or doctrines. He did not contradict or deny at one time, opinions which he had openly asserted at another. After labouring many years in the work of the ministry, he did not turn about, and propagate a system directly subversive of his former principles, under profession that it was more rational and consistent than the ancient gospel, and the result of clearer views, or more easily comprehended by the wisdom of men. He was not afraid to come out openly with all his sentiments; he did not conceal, or disguise them under a pretence that the minds of the people were not prepared to receive them. No, he preached the *gospel of Christ*—not the mere inventions of a depraved imagination, but the unchangeable truth as it is in Jesus. He never refused to bring his doctrines to the test of the sacred volume, but was ever *the first to appeal to it*, not only to prove the truth of all that he asserted, but to refute the errors of his adversaries. He sought not to lessen a proper regard and esteem of those invaluable records, by denying the solemn truths and holy precepts which they contain, or *telling the people "they were altered by the Pope,"* or *"written by nobody knows who,"* nor yet to apologize for his *constant appeal* to them, by saying that he did it on account of the ignorance and superstition of his hearers, and *"to draw them off from the scriptures by degrees."* No, he needed no such flimsy coverings;—he was above such unmanly artifices;—he was open—plain—honest—sincere in all he did; and great as was his service, honoured and beloved as he justly was by all who truly knew him; so far from seeking to undervalue Christ Jesus and his blessed offices, and to draw the people to himself, or get himself a party, and a great name among men, he accounted it his highest honour to turn the minds of all his hearers to Jesus Christ, and him crucified—to the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world, in whom he felt it to be his greatest joy and noblest privilege, to be a humble, devoted, and true believer.

CHAPTER VIII.

Remarks upon the Quotations made by the Compilers from the works of
EDWARD BURROUGH.

ON page 47 of the pamphlet, we are presented with a short extract, from the works of this excellent man. He was one of those who were early engaged, in defending the society of Friends from the unjust accusations of its enemies, who laboured industriously, to fix upon its members the odious character of denying the doctrines of the christian religion.—It is from a work of this description, that the compilers have taken their first quotation, and by a most unfair mutilation, have endeavoured to support the very charge which it was written to repel.

One Christopher Fowler published a book against the Quakers, in which he exhibits a number of charges, in the form of syllogisms; the third of which is—“ They that do not own the Lord Jesus Christ to be God *by nature*, are horrible blasphemers: But those called Quakers do not own the Lord Jesus Christ, to be God *by nature*: therefore they are blasphemers.”

From Edward Burrough’s reply to this high charge, the extract in the pamphlet is copied; and in order to enable the reader to judge more correctly, of the injury which they have done him, we shall insert the whole of his reply, and enclose their quotation in brackets, viz.

“ Answer to the third position; *In this, thou hast falsely accused*; but yet, let us consider thy words; [there was a nature, in “ that man, Jesus Christ, that was born of the Virgin, that was subject to cold, heat, thirst and hunger, and subject to be tempted of “ the devil; and this nature was not God; whose nature is infinite, eternal, unmeasurable, not subject to hunger nor thirst, nor “ to heat and cold, nor subject to temptations;] so that a man may say lawfully, and be no blasphemer, that there was a nature in him, which was not God; *and yet the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in him too, and he is the Everlasting Father, and the Father is in him, and he in the Father*: and thus by a sound interpretation of the word, (God by nature) thy major, and minor, and conclusion, are all made void.”—Page 637.

The manner in which the compilers have garbled this answer of E. B. in order to force upon him a denial of the divinity of our blessed Lord is really disgraceful.—They commence and end at a semicolon, omitting both the leading and concluding parts of the sentence, in which he denies the charge which they insinuate against him; by an open confession of his full belief in the Godhead of Jesus Christ. This partial quotation they place in their pamphlet, as though it were full, fair and complete.—By such un-

righteous means, the early Quakers, or any religious writer, might be made to avow the most unchristian doctrines; since if they did but recite the words of an opponent, or state a position to be discussed and refuted, it might be adduced by our compilers to prove that they held the very doctrines which they were opposing.

The sentiments which E. B. has asserted in the answer quoted, must be admitted to be sound and scriptural by every christian reader. He positively denies the charge of C. Fowler, as a false accusation. This then at once contradicts the *same charge*, alleged by the compilers.—He then proceeds to describe the manhood and Godhead of Jesus Christ, asserting that the *former* was not the *latter*, which must certainly be admitted to be correct; but that he may not thereby be construed to deny the Divinity, he asserts his belief in this also, in the most unequivocal terms. He acknowledges that the *fulness of the Godhead dwelt in him*, that he was the everlasting Father, and that the Father was in him, and he in the Father; all which is according to Scripture, and directly contrary to the notion of E. Hicks, that Christ was no more than an Israelite, endued with a portion of the Spirit.

On the same page of the pamphlet, we have about three lines, extracted from the middle of a long paragraph, on p. 56 of E. Burrough's journal, in which he is replying to an opponent, who charged the Quakers with "not only neglecting the weightier matters of the law, but the law itself, teaching men so to do;" and this, because they affirmed, that the Scriptures *were not the primary rule of faith and life*. E. B. clears the Society, from the charge of neglecting the precepts of the law, and then adds, [“ and this again I affirm, as] before I did in thy hearing, [that the Scripture is not the Saint's rule, but the Spirit which gave forth the Scripture, as the Scripture itself witnesses.”]

The compilers have omitted the words "before I did in thy hearing," and inserted in their place "I have done before." The extract they make, proves nothing more, than that Edward Burrough asserted the scriptures were not the primary and only rule of the saints, which the Quakers never believed they were. On the same page he says in reply to his opponent:

"I answer, *the scriptures we own*, and by that spirit which speaks them forth, *we witness them to be true*, and they are ours; and though you say they are the savour of death to us that perish, yet thou art found a liar, for we are saved out of the perishing state, and death is destroyed through death, through faith; and thou hast diminished from that scripture, 2 Tim. iii. 15, false prophet like again, and so art both an adder [to] and a diminisher; and *thou mayst read thy portion in Rev. xxii. 18, 19.*"

No less than five times, on this and the following page, does Edward Burrough declare that the Quakers own the scriptures.

The following extract, from his treatise entitled "A Standard lifted up," &c. will show fully the opinions of "primitive Friends," upon the subject of the Holy Scriptures, viz. "Concerning the Word of God, and concerning the scriptures, this testimony I give unto all the world.

The Word of God was in the beginning, before any creatures were made; and by it all things stand and remain unto this day; and the Word endures forever, and by it all things in heaven and in earth are brought to pass, which God doth; and it is from everlasting to everlasting, without beginning and without end; and the Word is powerful, dividing and discerning all things, even the secret thoughts of every man's heart; it is as a two edged sword, and as a fire, and like a hammer, to cut up, to burn, and to beat down; the Word of the Lord reconciles man again to Him; and this Word is in the mouth and in the heart, and the servants of the Lord handled, tasted, saw, and felt the Word of Life; and from it, spoke forth the scriptures, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, through the eternal spirit; and it is a declaration of the Word of Life, which was in the beginning, and endures forever; and it declares what the saints received, believed and enjoyed, and none can understand it, without the same spirit that gave it forth, and to such who have the same spirit, the scripture is profitable: the Word of God, which was in the beginning, and which endures forever, is not the scripture; which was not in the beginning, neither can it endure forever; but the scripture testifies of that Word, and that Word, witnesses to the scriptures; and THEY ARE NOT CONTRARY ONE TO THE OTHER, but gives witness each of other; but many hath the scripture that hath not the Word, neither knows it; BUT THEY THAT HAVE THE WORD, CANNOT BUT OWN THE SCRIPTURES; and this is the truth as it is in Jesus, testified to all the world by us; who doth deny them that hereof gives any other testimony."—Page 249.

Here are some very plain declarations, which look but little like coinciding with Elias Hicks' denial of the sacred volume. Edward Burrough asserts that the scriptures are the declaration of the Word of Life, given forth by holy men, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, that the Word, witnesses to the scripture; that they are not contrary one to the other; and that they who have the Word, cannot but own the scripture, and lastly, that the Quakers deny those who give any other testimony of them. According, therefore, to Edward Burrough's knowledge of the early Quakers, they not only denied the principles of Elias Hicks on this subject, but also those persons who held them.

In a paper entitled "Some considerations presented to the King of England," &c. he says—

"I do testify unto the King, and before the whole world, that we [the Quakers] do profess and believe, concerning the Father, Son and Spirit, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the blessed gospel, and the Holy Scriptures; I say we do believe, and make profession in truth and righteousness, concerning all these things; and by our doctrines and instructions, do persuade all people to believe; and not seduce any from these truths of the gospel, and this is known, through these kingdoms, concerning us, though we stand now accused falsely, concerning these matters before the king. But as for the scriptures being the rule of life, we say the spirit of God that gave forth the scriptures, is the rule of life and faith, unto the saints, and LEADS NOT

CONTRARY, BUT ACCORDING UNTO THE SCRIPTURES; *in the BELIEF and practice of whatsoever the scripture saith.*—Page 758.

It will necessarily follow from this declaration of Edward Burrough, on behalf of “primitive Friends,” that those doctrines which some, professing to be Quakers, are now promulgating, *contrary to the scriptures, are not sanctioned* by that spirit of God which is the saints’ rule, and consequently are *directly in opposition* to the *Christian principles* of our worthy ancient Friends.

On page 71 of the pamphlet, the compilers have inserted a part of E. Burrough’s reply to Samuel Eaton, who contended that “the sanctification of the first day of the week, had put an end to the sanctification of the seventh,” &c. To this Edward Burrough objects, because the scriptures no where tell us, that under the gospel dispensation, one day has any more *inherent holiness*, than another, but that all days are to be sanctified unto the Lord.

It was an opinion very common among the various denominations of professing Christians, in his time, that the first day of the week was the gospel Sabbath, or true saints’ rest, typified by the seventh day Sabbath, under the law; and that hence, the obligation to refrain from every species of labour on the first day, was equally as obligatory upon Christians; as the rigid observance of the seventh was upon the Jews. This notion, and the severity of the existing laws, in England, subjected our early Friends to much suffering, from the malice of persecuting informers, who falsely accused them of violating the Sabbath, when only engaged in the necessary and unavoidable duties of domestic life.

Convinced in their own minds, that the true gospel rest had a more spiritual and inward signification, and that it was to be witnessed in the secret of the soul; the early Quakers endeavoured to convince other professors, that from various passages in the sacred volume, it was evident, that with all their veneration of holy days, they were missing the real enjoyment of the saints’ rest, and too much confiding in the mere outward form without knowing the life and power.

But while they did this, they were religiously careful to be diligent and punctual in their attendance at their places for divine worship; and as scrupulously guarded against the performance of manual or servile labour, other than was indispensable, on that day, as those of other denominations. This is repeatedly asserted in their writings, when defending themselves from the charge of totally neglecting the observance of the Sabbath.

It is clearly apparent that the compilers design to make the impression, by their extract, that this charge was true—that our ancient Friends made no distinction between the first day and other days of the week. To do this the more effectually, they have added a note at the bottom of the page, stating that the sentiments of Edward Burrough were advanced and defended by all the early writers in the Society of Friends. It may be very true, that most, or all, of the early Friends, held the same sentiments respecting the sanctification of the first day of the week, as Edward Burrough did; and a number of writers have defended them; but it is *certainly true*, that *the compilers’ construction* of those sentiments, was neither advanced

ced nor defended by *any* of the Quakers or their writers. They have referred to several books, and to numerous pages, to support their illiberal insinuation, which we have examined with some care, and find them to treat almost exclusively on the nature of the *spiritual Sabbath*, under the gospel, and the doctrine of inherent holiness in the first day of the week. But we find *not one word* in any of the writings they refer to, or any where else, which encourages the members of the Society of Friends to open their shops, or pursue their ordinary avocations, upon this day of the week.

The compilers refer particularly to Isaac Pennington's works, quarto, vol. i. page 349, &c. where they say, "the subject is discussed at length, and many objections clearly and satisfactorily answered." This assertion is certainly untrue, with their construction of it; as any person may readily see by turning to Isaac Pennington's works. The pages they refer to, include four essays; the first is entitled, "The New Covenant of the Gospel, distinguished from the Old Covenant of the Law, and the *Rest or Sabbath of Believers*, from the Rest or Sabbath of the Jews, &c." the second is, "An Epistle to all such as observe the Seventh day of the week, for the Sabbath of the Lord;" the third is an answer to, "Some queries sent in writing, upon occasion of an Epistle, directed to all such as observe the Seventh day of the week, for a Sabbath;" and the fourth is "A Brief Explication of the Mystery of the Six days Labour, and Seventh day's Sabbath, &c." In all these essays, as the reader may perceive from the titles of them, the subject treated of, is the christian's sanctified, spiritual rest, and the appointed Sabbath of the Jews: and not one word is said throughout the whole, against the sober and regular observance of the first day of the week, as a day of religious worship and cessation from bodily labour.

Among other early writers in the Society of Friends, whom the compilers unjustly cite, in order to prove their non-observance of the first day of the week; (with a view of procuring some authority for the known violation of it by Elias Hicks,) they refer to R. Barclay. We shall quote his words, in order that the reader may see, how contrary the principles and practice of the early Quakers were to those of Elias Hicks on this subject. In his essay entitled, "William Mitchell Unmasked," to which the compilers refer, Robert Barclay says—

"His 13th head, is concerning the Sabbath, or First day of the week's being so, as to which, I desire the reader first to take notice; that as we believe the apostles and primitive christians did meet this day to worship God; *so we as following their example, do the like, and forbear working, or using our lawful occasions upon that day, as much as our adversaries*: so that the debate is *only*, Whether there be any inherent holiness in this day, more than in another? or if there be any positive command for it *from scripture?* particularly if the fourth command bind us to the observation of it?"—Barclay's Folio Works, page 91.

The compilers also refer to his Apology, from which we shall quote his observations on this subject, viz.

"We not seeing any ground in scripture for it, cannot be so su-

perstitious as to believe, that either the Jewish Sabbath now continues, or that the first day of the week is the antitype thereof, or the *true christian Sabbath*, which with Calvin we believe to have a *more spiritual sense*: and therefore we know no moral obligation by the fourth command, or elsewhere, to keep the first day of the week more than any other, or any holiness inherent in it. But first, forasmuch as *it is necessary that there be some time set apart for the saints to meet together to wait upon God*; and that secondly, *it is fit at some times they be freed from their other outward affairs*; and that, thirdly, *reason and equity doth allow that servants and beasts, have some time allowed them, to be eased from their continual labour*; and that fourthly, *it appears that the apostles and primitive christians, did use the first day of the week for these purposes; we find ourselves sufficiently moved for these causes to do so also, without superstitiously straining the scriptures for another reason*; which, that it is not to be there found, many protestants, yea, Calvin himself, upon the fourth command, hath abundantly evinced. And though we *therefore meet, and abstain from working upon this day*, yet doth not that hinder us, for having meetings also for worship at other times."—Barclay's Apology, pages 349, 350.

George Keith, having falsely accused the Society of Friends with disregarding the observance of the First day of the week, the authors of the "Serious Examination," replied to the charge; and after stating reasons why it is not the christian Sabbath, &c. they conclude thus—

"But to conclude this point, we grant as George Keith hath done; 'And that besides other times set apart for the worship of God, both in public and private, *it is commendable in christians, to set apart the First day of the week, from common and ordinary labour*; not only for an ease to their servants and cattle, but also that they may with the more freedom, and cheerful readiness attend upon the Lord and his service *without all incumbrance*.'—Presb. and Indep. vis. churches. And we further add, that *we may be truly thankful, that there are laws, to restrain the people of this nation, from their common servile work on the First days of the week*; and that God has put it into the hearts of the government, to grant liberty for the subjects, (especially all protestants,) to resort to such religious meetings, (on the first days and others,) as they are in conscience persuaded unto: *Blessed be our God, for such liberty and such opportunities*.'"—Pages 47, 48.

Again, on page 72, George Keith says, "*They, [the Quakers,] allow doing servile work, as opening shop on the Lord's day, to sell goods, and taylor's to mend clothes on that day*;"—to which the authors of the Examination reply—

"*We know no such allowance given by the said people, called Quakers; and their practice shows the contrary*: How many of their shops has this adversary seen open, and how many taylor's employed by them, on that day, he calls the Lord's day?"—Page 72.

CHAPTER IX.

Remarks upon the Quotations from HUMPHREY SMITH.

On page 47 of the pamphlet, the compilers have inserted a short quotation from the "True Rule Discovered," by Humphrey Smith; the object of which, we are at a loss to discover, as the doctrine it teaches, is perfectly consonant with the Holy Scriptures. We shall insert the passage a little more at length, viz :

"And now the light is in man, and so that he, that is with His, to the end of the world, is the light of the world *who is the resurrection and the life, who was dead and is alive*, and I say, *he liveth forever more*, who hath finished his work, in the outward things, to wit: Circumcision, Baptism, the Supper, *and death on the cross without the gate*; and is now revealed within, and worketh all our works in us, and *ever liveth to make intercession for us*, Isaiah, xxvi. 12; Heb. vii. 25, in whose hearts he is now crying, Abba, Father; and he that hath the Son, hath also the Father; to whom be eternal dominion, glory, honour, and humble obedience, forevermore. And so [“ Christ Jesus, being guided by that of God, or rather *the fulness of God in him*, whereby he finished his work, and departed away “ from among them, and bid them wait for that which should abide “ with them forever;] and said, these things have I spoken unto you, *being yet present with you*, but the Comforter, *whom the Father will send in my name*, he shall teach you all things, John xiv. 16, 25, 26, and that which teaches all things, was to be revealed within, &c.”—p. 149.

From this extract, it is clearly apparent, that Humphrey Smith believed fully, both in the outward coming, and sufferings, &c. of our blessed Lord, his mediation and intercession on behalf of sinful man, and also his spiritual appearance in the soul. He acknowledges the *Divinity* as well as manhood, asserting that the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in him, and that the Father sent the Comforter in Christ's name. This extract alone is amply sufficient to show, how directly opposite his belief was, to the notions now promulgated by Elias Hicks; who asserts that our blessed Lord had the Spirit communicated to him only, *as man, in such proportion* as seemed necessary, and that God never set him above us.—See his Sermons.

The next quotation from this author, is on the subject of the scriptures being the primary and only rule of Faith and Life. The following extract will explain his meaning, viz :—

“But say the people, though *they* did walk, and direct others to walk by the Spirit, yet are not we now to walk by the scriptures? And is not the scriptures now to be our rule? and are we not to be led by that?”

“ To which I answer, That [God changeth not; and where
 “ doth the scriptures say, that the scripture is to be a rule, to walk
 “ or be led by? And the ministers of Christ did not say, As eve-
 “ ry man hath received the scriptures, so walk; but as every man
 “ hath received Christ, (and he is the light,) so walk]—Co-
 lossians, ii. 6. Consider there is first something to be received, and
 then, there is to be a walking in the power and strength of that re-
 ceived, &c.”—p. 150.

It is evident that Humphrey Smith is only contending against the erroneous idea, that under the dispensation of the gospel, the Holy Scriptures are to be *preferred before* the Spirit of Christ Jesus, inwardly revealed, and made the *alone rule* of the saint's faith and life. But that he was far from disesteeming the sacred volume, or endeavouring to lessen a true regard for it in others, will be apparent from the following quotation from page 152, of the same book. After defending the revelations of the blessed Comforter, as the guide, and rule under the gospel, and declaring that he fulfils that, which is written without, viz: in the scriptures, he says:—

“ What then? do I herein, *in the least make void, contemn, slight, vilify, or deny the scriptures?* God forbid; nay, I had rather my pen might fall out of my hand, or my arm from my shoulder, or my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth forever, than I should go about to make void the scriptures of truth, (and is a true declaration, Luke i. 1.) which was given forth from that which is my life, which is hid, not in the scriptures, but with Christ in God, Colos. iii. 3. and the Word was God, and that which was God, is God, John i. 1; but if I should say the scriptures is God, I should be a blasphemer, like unto others: Do I herein deny the scriptures? Nay, rather, I establish the scriptures in its place, and make use of it, as a cloud of witnesses by me, in directing all people unto that which the scriptures testify of, and was given forth from; John v, 39, &c.”—Page 152.

* As we had not in our possession, a copy of the works of Humphrey Smith, we have not the opportunity of comparing the above quotations with the original, but have no doubt whatever of their perfect accuracy. The compilers have inserted on page 32 of their pamphlet, two short extracts from the writings of THOMAS ZACHARY. On examining “Whiting's Catalogue,” we find that the whole amount published by this author, was *four quarto sheets*. As we have not been able to obtain these, we cannot say, whether the extracts in the pamphlet are fairly made. If they are, however, they do not prove anything in favour of the doctrines of Elias Hicks. In the first, the author says, he came to see the idolatry of professors, respecting the body, flesh, and blood of Christ; this is, as he himself explains it, placing *all their faith on this alone*, without regarding the invisible power, the Godhead which dwelt in him, which was the Life, Power, and Arm of God. But this does not make our blessed Lord to be a mere man; it does not rob him of his equality with the Father, but confesses to his Manhood, as well as Eternal Divinity. In the next quotation Thomas Zachary says, there is no serving God aright, but in *a measure* of that Spirit, wherewith Christ served him. This all Christians readily admit; but observe he does not say we are to be equal with Christ, and that God never set Christ above us, as does Elias Hicks; but that through the assistance of *a measure*, of the same Spirit which our blessed Saviour had in fulness, we are to be qualified for the performance of all our religious duties.

There could scarcely be a more reverent confession to the inestimable value of the sacred volume, than is here made by Humphrey Smith. Let the reader compare it with the light manner in which Elias Hicks speaks of them, and undervalues their authority—telling the people they were altered by the Pope, and “written by nobody knows who”—and boldly denying the most precious and sacred doctrines which they teach.

CHAPTER X.

Remarks upon the Quotations from the Works of SAMUEL FISHER.

THE compilers have inserted on p. 48 of the pamphlet, a short quotation, on the subject of imputation, which they inform us is from Samuel Fisher's Works—but give no page. We have carefully examined the volume published by this author, and cannot discover that he ever wrote any such passage. He has written about forty pages on the subject of justification and the atonement by Christ, in which he makes frequent acknowledgment of his christian belief in both. If there be any thing like the compilers' extract, in his works, we imagine it must be altered, so as to bear little resemblance to the original—and whenever they think proper to inform us where it may be found, we shall be ready to reply to it.

The following extracts will serve to show the scriptural soundness of S. Fisher's belief.

“ And because we make mention of Christ in us, and the righteousness of the law as necessary in order to salvation, to be performed and fulfilled in our own persons, as Paul does, Romans viii. 4. though we mean no other righteousness than the same that is in Christ, and is wrought in us, by no other power than that of Christ, and that same Christ too, of whom the Scripture speaks, that “ to him give all the prophets witness, Acts x. that in his name and through faith in his name alone, whoever believeth, shall receive remission of sins; than which Christ and his name, there is no other under heaven, given among men, whereby they must be saved; they belie us both to God and men, as denyers of Christ, and of his righteousness, and of justification by Christ alone; witness one Ackworth of Rochester, who was once heard by the writer hereof, deprecating and declaring against the Quakers in these words to God himself, in his public prayer, viz. Above all things Lord, (quoth he,) deliver this poor city from the Quakers; they are a people, Lord, that deny God, deny Christ, deny the righteousness of Christ, deny justification by Christ alone.”—Page 34.

S. F. proceeds to state that he offered to prove these charges false at the time they were made, but was not permitted; and he gives also, other instances in which the same unfounded accusations were alleged against friends, all which he denies to be true.

On p. 654, in arguing against the notion that Christ died only on behalf of some, and that he was a sacrifice for the sins of believers only, he says,

“ Argument 11th. If all men are not put into a possibility of life by Christ's dying intentionally for every one of them, if themselves choose not death; then it could not be said, As by sin, condemnation is come on all men, so justification of life is come on all

men ; and that the gift of God's grace, *and gift of God in Christ*, and the benefit and blessing, is, every way, at least as large, and some ways larger and abounding, beyond the mischief and curse that comes by the sin.

“ But it is in effect so said, Romans v. 15. xviii. 23. 'Therefore all and every man, is made as capable to be saved by *Christ*, as every man is liable to be damned by reason of the sin.

“ Argument 12th. Christ could not be truly or properly said to be the *propitiation for the sins of the whole world*, nor the *Saviour of the whole world* ; to be given a covenant to the people ; a witness to the people, a Leader and Commander to the people, a light to the nations, God's salvation to the ends of the earth ; much less could all people, in any consistency with mercy, or (as before) without foolery and mockery of most men, in the midst of their remediless misery, be bid to behold him, or all the ends of the earth, be summoned with promise, yea, assurance of salvation, if they do, and on pain of more cruel damnation, if they do not ; *to look and come to Him*, for it, and hearken to his voice, (or else, be cut off,) in all things whatever he saith to them, and such like, unless he were truly, properly, and intentionally at least, given to be *all this, to all men* ; all the people, the whole world, and every man in it.”

From these short quotations, (and there is much more of the same import in his writings,) it is sufficiently evident, that S. F. did believe in the propitiatory sacrifice of our blessed Lord, for the sins of the *whole world* ; a doctrine which E. Hicks, does positively reject, and therefore dissents entirely from the acknowledged tenets of the early Quakers.

On p. 61 and 62 of the pamphlet we have another quotation from the works of this author, in which he objects to the numerous commentaries, which have been written upon the text of holy Scripture, as tending rather to obscure than render them more perspicuous ; and likewise against that undue reverence for the Scriptures themselves, which leads men to place them *above the Holy Spirit of God*, and to honour *the gift, more than the giver*.—It is worthy of remark, that in the commencement of the treatise, from which the compilers have taken their extract, he lays it down as a certain position, that in all he says on the Scriptures, “ it is the *letter* and not the *matter, the writings*, and not the subjects, things, truths, doctrines or Word, written of, that is the subject to come under consideration,” between him and his opponent, and therefore he does not in the least degree impugn any doctrine or precept contained in the sacred volume.—The following quotations will acquit him from coinciding with E. Hicks in a denial of the doctrines of Christ and his apostles, viz.

“ The outward Scripture I say, is profitable, to such as Timothy was ; to men of God, to make them who are wise in the Spirit, *wiser and wiser*, through their faith in the light, *to their own and others' salvation* ; and to furnish such a minister as Timothy was, who knows when, (and being in the Spirit) how, and how far forth to use it, *for every good work* in his ministry. And such as are full of might and power first by the Spirit of the Lord upon them, as Micah was, Micah iii. and as Apollos was, *are mighty also in the Scrip-*

sure, and furnished mightily, to confound the scripture searching scribes, and all gainsayers of the light, as they were in their times."—Page 453.

"As for our obedience to the letter, we are by the Spirit, so bound to that, not so far only as we are willing, as thou beliest us, but in a cross to our own wills, that while we walk in the Spirit, which is our rule, we cannot disobey the letter, but fulfil it; while yourselves, who prate of your being bound to obey it, walk at large after your own wills, and lusts, in the liberty of the flesh, and through your boundless boasting of that, ye as boundlessly break, do dishonour both God and yourselves.

"As for our going about to deceive the simple, we deny all deceivers, and deceit; teaching no other doctrine nor gospel, than what Paul delivered, than which, whoever it is that brings or broaches another, whether it be we who are hated as devils, or you who are honoured as angels of light from heaven, by such as dwell in the depths and darkness of hell, I say with Paul, let him be accursed; but those are now marked and manifested plainly enough, who cause the divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine the Saints learned of old; and by the children of the day are avoided also; for they that are such, serve not the Lord Jesus Christ, but their own bellies, and yet by good words and fair speeches, deceive the hearts of the simple, Rom. xvi. 17, 18."—Page 458.

Again, on page 667, "Objection—The Letter kills—cannot give life.

"Reply.—True, but why is it? but because its disobeyed, and cannot give ability to any, to do what it requires—The law, or light, and gospel, and all, kills such as transgress it, I say the gospel itself condemns; but whom is it? None but such as hate, and take not heed to it, that thereby they may come from under the curse and death, into the life it calls for; else, it being the power of God to the salvation of such as believe in it, life should be by the light one way more, than it could come by the letter; for the letter could keep them, that keep it, from the curse denounced in it, to the breakers of it, yet cannot give any, an ability to keep it: But the light is not only able to acquit, justify, clear, absolve, secure, and save from wrath, all such as believe in, and obey it, but also to enable such as look to it, and impower them, more and more to obey and walk by it; and consequently by the letter, which cannot be transgressed by such as abide in the light; all such as singly come to it, and continue waiting on the Lord in it."

In answer to the question, "Whether are the Spirit of God, the Spirit of man, and the Spirit of the devil, three distinct Spirits? S. Fisher replies, "Yea, the Spirit of God, the Spirit of the devil, and the Spirit of man are three distinct Spirits."—page 846.

Here are several points, in which S. Fisher is directly at variance with the notions of Elias Hicks. He acknowledges the usefulness of the Holy Scripture; that they are profitable to make wiser, even those who are already wise in the Spirit, and to furnish the man of God unto every good work; whereas, Elias Hicks asserts that since the Spirit has come, we should be better without the scriptures. S.

Fisher says, the early Quakers were *bound by the Spirit, to be obedient to the letter*, not so far as they were willing only, but in the cross to their own wills—that *they could not disobey the letter*, but fulfil it; but Elias Hicks does disobey it, by teaching many notions which directly contradict its sacred testimony. S. Fisher says, if any man preach *any other gospel*, than that *which Paul preached*, let him be accused—yet Elias Hicks does teach doctrines entirely different and opposite to that gospel which Paul preached—and “contrary to the doctrine which the saints learned of old.” S. Fisher says, that those who receive and obey the light, and abide in it, cannot transgress the letter, or scriptures, therefore it is clear, that “the dangerous innovations” of Elias Hicks, are *positively condemned in the most solemn manner*, by the very authors whom the compilers quote. Another point of difference, is the existence of an evil Spirit, distinct from the propensities and will and spirit of men, which Elias Hicks has long notoriously denied, but which S. Fisher here asserts—From all which it is fully proved, that Elias Hicks has really swerved from the ancient faith of the Society, and is promulgating notions, subversive of those precious testimonies and doctrines, in support of which, our worthy predecessors suffered the loss of all that this world accounts most dear.

CHAPTER XI.

Observations upon the Compilers' Extracts from the Writings of RICHARD HUBBERTHORN.

ON page 52, of the pamphlet, the compilers have given us two quotations, from the works of this author, each about three lines. They are parts of replies to the objections of the two opponents, who denied the doctrine of the influence of the Holy Spirit, and contended that the Scriptures were the only rule of faith and life.

The first is from his answer to John Stelham, viz :

“Further, he, [John Stelham,] saith, the scriptures are a rule above the saint's light, *and unto it* : and not so, their light above the scriptures ;” to which R. Hubberthorn rejoins, “this is confusion, and he knows not whereof he affirms ; [for the Spirit of God is the “saint's rule, and that is greater than the scriptures, and the rule “of the Spirit of God, is above the scripture.] but such as John Stelham, who talks of scriptures to be a rule, and yet acts these things, which the scriptures *declare against*, are but found in deeper hypocrisy ; for he *that is ruled by the Spirit of God, walks up in the fulfilling of Scripture.*”—Works, page 142.

It was well for the compilers' cause, that they closed their quotation at the semicolon ; since if they had extended it but a few lines further, they must have included a declaration of R. Hubberthorn's, which is in direct opposition to Elias Hicks. If “he that is *ruled by the Spirit of God, walks up, in the fulfilling of Scripture,*” as this author says ; it follows that such as do not fulfil, but reject and deny the scriptures, are not ruled by the spirit of God. Hence we may readily see, that as Elias Hicks *does* reject and deny the testimony of scripture, as relates to the miraculous conception, divinity, and propitiation, &c. of Jesus Christ, he cannot be in unity with the faith of the ancient Quakers.

The next quotation is from the same treatise, viz :

“Further, he, [J. Stelham,] saith, [the scripture was given by “the spirit for a rule ; this, [says R. Hubberthorn,] we desire a proof “of by plain scripture, and till then, we deny it.”]—page 145.

The reader will see, that in this reply, R. Hubberthorn, so far from denying scripture, lays it down as the test of the truth or error, of his opponent's assertion—which is certainly making it a standard for the soundness of doctrine. His opponent says, “the scripture was given by the spirit for a rule.”—R. Hubberthorn demands proof of it by plain scripture, and until he produce this, denies it. The passage, so far from undervaluing the scriptures, gives them a very high character, and commits to their decision the question in dispute between himself and his opponents.

To infer from a short reply, to the erroneous assertion of an oppo-

ment; that this worthy man denied the authenticity or authority of Holy Scripture, as the compilers would have us to do, from their quotations, would be an act of great injustice to him. The whole tenor of his writings directly contradict such a conclusion. The following may be sufficient to show this. Thomas Winterton made the following charge against the Society, viz :

“That *now*, the scripture is no more a guide for us to walk by, nor nothing without them, but the light within them, and he that seeks after any other guide but that within him, is in the flesh still.” To this R. Hubberthorn replies—

“Which words are thy own, and was not so spoken, by any of us. But to thee I say, that the scripture, which did foresee that which we now do see, *we own to be one with the light*, which was before the letter, and to be our guide in the way of truth: and this guide is within us; but by the scripture letter, without thee, thou neither sees nor foresees the things which belong to eternal life, which, if ever any come to see, it must be by the light of Christ within them; *and all who own this light, and with it is guided, cannot deny the scriptures which was spoken forth from the light within.*” Pages 76, 77.

This short quotation speaks a direct denial and condemnation to the dogmas of Elias Hicks. Since R. Hubberthorn *says positively*, that *all who own and are guided by the Light of Christ, cannot deny the scriptures.*

On page 117, after having answered a number of erroneous notions, advanced by John Stelham, and proved their unsoundness from scripture authority, Richard Hubberthorn adds, “In reading of this let all people take notice, that in the several and particular heads of John Stelham’s book, where he saith he hath contradicted us, he is proved himself to *contradict the scriptures*; and *so far as he contradicts the scriptures*, in those particulars; *so far*, he may say he *contradicts us*; our testimony being *one with the scriptures* in those things.”

If the reader will take the pains to refer to Richard Hubberthorn’s works, he will find that “the several and particular heads of John Stelham’s book,” comprehend the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, in regard to which R. Hubberthorn says that the Quakers’ testimony is one with the scriptures. So far, then, as Elias Hicks contradicts the scriptures, which he does in many of the primary and fundamental articles of the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, so far he contradicts the early Quakers, and proves that he has swerved from the ancient faith of the society.

In a discourse which R. Hubberthorn had with King Charles II. the latter asked him—

“How did you first come to believe the scriptures were truth?”

R. H.—“I have believed the scriptures, from a child, to be a declaration of truth, when I had but a literal knowledge, natural education, and tradition; but *now I know the scriptures to be true, by the manifestation and operation of the spirit of God, fulfilling them in me.*”—Page 271.

Is then the spirit of God changed? Or doth it teach *now* contra-

ry to what it taught in the time of Richard Hubberthorn? Or, seeing God is *unchangeable, and cannot lie*; cannot deny what he has once asserted, is it not clearly evident, that those who plead the guidance of the spirit of truth, for their denial of the most solemn declarations of Holy Scripture, are under delusion and error, and are not led by that spirit of truth which guides into all truth?

We have a quotation from the same author, inserted on pages 52, 53, of their pamphlet, designed to convey the idea that the early Quakers denied the existence of any other heaven or hell, than what is in man; which, of course, the compilers must consider as one of the tenets of Elias Hicks. The quotation is as follows:

“And again, as concerning hell, Clapham [saith, that men are not in hell while they are upon earth.

“Answer.—The prophet said, while he was upon earth, thou hast redeemed my soul out of hell; and Jonah said, out of the belly of hell, cried I unto thee, and so the believers’ doctrine was contrary to Clapham’s; for they knew both heaven and hell, while they were upon earth, and a redeeming out of the one into the other, *by Jesus Christ.*”—Works, page 33.

The assertion of J. Clapham, and the reply of R. Hubberthorn, furnish no ground whatever, for supposing that the latter denied that heaven was a place of eternal rewards to the righteous, and hell a place where the impenitent sinner shall endure everlasting torment, where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. The answer is no more than an assertion, that the Royal Psalmist, and the prophet Jonah, experienced a foretaste, while here on earth, of the terrors and woe of that interminable punishment prepared for the wicked hereafter. But this does not imply that there is no *future state or place*, where just retribution will be rendered to every man, according to his deeds. Richard Hubberthorn has sufficiently denied the construction which the compilers would put upon his words, in his reply to J. Clapham, who alleged the same false charge against him, viz:

“And whereas many other accusations are charged upon us *falsely*, for the name of Christ, by the priest; yet seeing Christ, the true Prophet, hath said it should be so, because they know not the Father, nor Him who hath enlightened every one that cometh into the world; therefore, can we bear all things, being manifest unto God, and to all men, *to be witnesses of those things which he saith we deny.*

“His accusations are these, that we deny the *resurrection of the body, the last judgment, heaven and hell*, are enemies to all the ordinances of Christ, are not true mortified persons, and our doctrine tendeth not to destroy sin; that we are the common sink of all heresies and enemies to civility and good manners.

“Answer—*Our doctrine is the same as is testified of in the scripture of truth*; and where it is received, remission of sins is received; it being the same that our example, the First Born amongst many brethren, the First Begotten from the dead, preached, which gospel we preach to every creature; which gospel is the power of God, and where it is received doth both destroy sin, and sanctify them through out in body, soul, and spirit. and by it, is the members which are

upon the earth, mortified: for this is the power that raised up Jesus from the dead, and doth also quicken our mortal bodies, *by his Spirit*, that dwelleth in us, in which *the scripture is witnessed*, which was a *treatise of those things* which was *known and surely believed* amongst the saints; and which saith, they that are asleep in the dust of the earth, shall rise, some to *everlasting life*, and some to *everlasting shame and contempt*: and from the true foundation, witnessing these doctrines, which the apostles did not lay again the foundation of; repentance from dead works, and faith towards God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and laying on of hands, and of the resurrection from the dead, and of *eternal judgment*, Heb. vi. 12, for we, having learned what it is to be baptized for the dead, *deny* such as say there is no resurrection of the dead; the first fruits of this resurrection is Christ, 1 Cor. xv. 22, of which they that are of Christ, are witnesses of these things, and they come to know each seed in the light, through the figures, and through the parables."—Pages 39, 40.

He then proceeds to speak more at large, upon the subject of the resurrection, and in conclusion declares, that by the Spirit of the Lord, the Quakers have received the knowledge, and are made witnesses of those things which the prophets and apostles of Jesus Christ testified of in the scriptures, whatever envious opposers may say to the contrary. It is obvious from the above quotation, that Richard Hubberthorn was far from denying a day of eternal judgment, or that heaven and hell were *places* in which the righteous enjoyed everlasting rewards, and the wicked endless woe and misery; since, when he was charged with holding such sentiments, he declares it to be false, and asserts that the doctrine of the Quakers is the same as is testified of in the Holy Scriptures. It follows therefore, that whatever doctrines are not coincident with the testimony of Holy Scripture, are not those held by the primitive friends.

Among the numerous calumnies which George Keith heaped upon the Quakers, after he had apostatised from their christian principles, we find the very same, as the compilers would have us to infer from their extract from Richard Hubberthorn. George Keith says "*They deny any other heaven or hell than what is within men*, calling all other Mahometanism." To this, the authors of the Serious Examination reply—

"This is also unfairly stated: For though both heaven and hell may *in some sense and degree*, be in men; that is, a degree of heaven or heavenly places, in the righteous, in Christ Jesus; and some degree of hell, terrors, tribulation and anguish in the wicked, even in this life: *yet heaven [is] not wholly within one, nor hell wholly within the other*, in this life, but an earnest thereof; for *heaven is both within and without, and so is hell*; yet both are discovered within, before fully entered into; both the joy of the one, and unto many, the terrors of the other: And how can treacherous Judases, and envious apostates, escape the damnation thereof? 'Tis certain that the children of the light and of the day, have no utter darkness, (where hell is,) within them, they being delivered out of the kingdom of darkness, into the kingdom of the dear Son of God"—Serious Examination, pages 71, 72.

CHAPTER XII.

Remarks upon the quotations from the works of WILLIAM DEWSBURY.

The compilers have inserted upon page 53 of their pamphlet, a short quotation, of about three lines, from the works of William Dewsbury, designed to convey the idea, that this worthy man, had a light esteem of the sacred volume. They have made the extract with great unfairness as will be seen from the following quotation. The part which they have selected, is enclosed in brackets as usual.

“And this I declare to all the inhabitants in England, and all that dwell upon the earth, that God alone is the teacher of his people, and hath given to every one a measure of grace, which is the light that comes from Christ, that checks and reproves for sin, in the secrets of the heart and conscience; and all that wait in that light which comes from Christ, (which is the free grace of God,) for the power of Jesus Christ to destroy sin, and to guide them in obedience to the light, so shall they come to know the only true God, and Father of light in Christ Jesus, who is the way to him: ¶ [And this I witness to all the sons of men, that the knowledge of eternal life, I came not to, by the letter of the scripture, nor hearing men speak of the name of God;] ¶ I came to the true knowledge of the scripture, and the eternal rest, (they testify it in Christ,) by the inspiration of the spirit of Jesus Christ, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, who alone is found worthy to open the seals of the book; and I witness, none else can, for he alone opened the seals of the book in me, and sealed it up to my soul, by the testimony of his own spirit, according to his own promise, I will bind up the testimony, and seal the law amongst my disciples; and I will write my law in their hearts, and put my spirit in their inward parts, and they shall not depart from me; neither shall they need to teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, for all shall know me from the least of them to the greatest, for I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more, and all my children shall be taught of me, saith the Lord God, and great shall be the peace of my children; and this here declared, the scriptures witness, and I witness the scriptures fulfilled in me; praises, praises, hallelujah and eternal praises, be unto the Lord God Almighty, who hath taken unto thee thy great power to sit upon thy throne, and to the LAMB forever more.”—pages 54, 55.

The extract made by the compilers closes at a semicolon, where William Dewsbury is declaring that he came to the true knowledge of the scriptures, and the eternal rest, which the scriptures testify

of, by the inspiration of the Spirit of Jesus Christ. There is sufficient in the paragraph we have quoted, to show, how far he was from undervaluing the sacred volume; but the following declaration is so very forcible, and applies with such precision to the present subject, that we think proper to insert it. It is taken from an essay, entitled "Christ Exalted, &c.;" in which William Dewsbury refuted a number of false accusations, preferred against the Quakers by John Timson, and also answers several questions, among which is the following:—


"Whether any other *revelations* and observations, *not to be found in the scripture*, be binding to the consciences of those persons, that have the benefit of the scripture; or whether such revelation, or dictates within a man's heart and soul, be as binding to the conscience, and to be urged to a man's self, or others, as the scriptures are?"

"ANSWER, THE REVELATIONS OF JESUS CHRIST, IS ACCORDING TO SCRIPTURE, which revelation *binds up the testimony, and seals the law*, in the hearts of his disciples; and *what dictates, is in the conscience or heart of man, contrary to the law and testimony*, is not to be regarded, *but disowned and judged*, with the Light which comes from Christ, the Saints' Life, *who guides them in a pure life and holy conversation*, ACCORDING TO SCRIPTURE—Isaiah viii. 20."—Works, pages 148, 149.

This query and answer is a most triumphant refutation of all the pretensions of Elias Hicks and his friends, to coincidence in doctrine with the early Quakers. William Dewsbury declares that *the revelations of Jesus Christ are according to scripture*—it follows that *what is not according to scripture, is not the revelation of Jesus Christ, but a delusion*. Again he says, that whatever dictates, in the heart and conscience of man, are contrary to scripture; they are not to be regarded, *but disowned and judged*, by the Light which comes from Christ. Now as the doctrines of Elias Hicks are not according to scripture—they cannot be the revelations of Jesus Christ; and as they contradict and deny the testimony of the scriptures of truth, they ought not to be regarded or followed; but are condemned by that light which comes from Jesus Christ, and which according to William Dewsbury, always leads its followers into a life and conversation *which accords with the testimony of the sacred volume*. Thus we see that the very authors whom the compilers have adduced, as authority for the innovations and unsound doctrines of Elias Hicks, judge and condemn him, in the most decisive and positive manner, as one who has gone from the leadings of the Holy Spirit, and wandered into the mazes of error and doubt.

Page 66 of the pamphlet has a quotation from William Dewsbury, which the compilers have, as usual, mutilated. We shall insert the whole paragraph, and enclose their extract in brackets with a hand. It is from the reply to John Timson, viz:—

"The sixth false accusation; thou sayest we boast that we are as perfect as Christ that died at Jerusalem.

"Reply—Thy charge is false, boasting we deny, or any perfection that is of self;  [our righteousness, *without Christ*, is as a

“filthy rag, and a menstruous cloth; Christ our righteousness, who
 “is the true light that lighteth every one that comes into the world,
 “John i. 9, we witness him the same Christ as was in that body that
 “suffered at Jerusalem; and every one of the children of light in
 “the measure of growth in Him, the same mind is in them, that was
 “in Christ Jesus, Phil. ii. 5] who is the brightness of the Fa-
 ther’s glory, Heb. i. 3.”—Works, p. 120.

This answer, furnishes us with an acknowledgment of several im-
 portant points of christian doctrine. It appears from it, that the
 early Quakers denied as false, the accusation of professing them-
 selves as perfect as Jesus Christ. Elias Hicks maintains, that by
 faithfulness we may attain to as great a degree of righteousness as
 he did. The Quakers believed that their own righteousness, was of
 no value, without Christ—and that Christ was their righteousness;
 but Elias Hicks condemns this doctrine of being made righteous by
 the righteousness of Christ. The Quakers declared they witness-
 ed, that he who enlightened them by his Spirit, was the same Lord
 Jesus Christ, who died at Jerusalem, and that the children of this
 Holy Light, according to their *measures* of growth, were in Him,
 who is the brightness of the Father’s glory.

It seems difficult to conjecture for what purpose the compilers
 have selected this extract, since it is so far from according with the
 doctrines which they wish to support, that it is directly contrary to
 them. It is, however, by no means so difficult to see why they have
 cut off the last eight words of the paragraph, and closed at a com-
 ma. It is a true saying, that a straw will show which way the wind
 blows; and small as the omission seems, it clearly evinces how wil-
 ling they are to suppress those parts of sentences, where the Divi-
 nity of the Saviour is recognised. Justice to the religious senti-
 ments of W. Dewsbury, should have induced them to exhibit that
 part, since he quotes from and refers to, a part of the scriptures
 where the Godhead and glorious attributes of our Lord and Sa-
 viour Jesus Christ, are set forth in the most unequivocal language.

Immediately following the paragraph last quoted, we have an-
 other accusation and reply, viz.

“The seventh false accusation; thou sayest, we say that he that
 trusts in Christ, that died at Jerusalem, for salvation, shall be de-
 ceived.”

Reply.—“This charge is false as the other, in the presence of
 God, we witness against thee; *no other Christ we bear testimony of,*
 to be the salvation of lost man and woman, but *that Christ,* accord-
 ing to scripture testimony, who was *born of the Virgin, and made a*
good confession before Pilate, and suffered at Jerusalem, and rose
again the third day, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right
hand of God; and this Christ we witness the true light, who lighteth
 every one that comes into the world, and saith, I stand at the door
 and knock; who opens, I will come into him, and sup with him, and
 he with me; Rev. iii. 20. and we witness him faithful: and as many
 as receive him, to them he gives power to become the sons of God;
 and *this is the condemnation of all, because they believe not in him*
 John xii.”—Pages 120, 121.

CHAPTER XIII.

Observations upon the Quotation from the Journal of RICHARD DAVIES.

THE compilers of the pamphlet have extracted a paragraph from the Journal of Richard Davies, in which he recites an opinion delivered by an Independent preacher, at a meeting where R. Davies was present; which was, that the time would come, when there would be no need of the scripture, any more than another book: this sentiment very much stumbled R. Davies, who queried with him, when that time would be; to which the preacher replied, when the Lord would make a new covenant with his people, as is foretold in Jeremiah xxxi. 33, 34, which contains the prophecy respecting the diffusion of the Holy Spirit. It will be sufficient for us to remark that Richard Davies was not in profession with the Society of Friends at that time, nor until two years after; and the opinion of an Independent teacher is no authority for the doctrine of primitive Friends.

The high estimation in which Richard Davies held the sacred volume, may be seen by any one who will peruse the work from which the extract is made. His religious education had been among a people whose entire dependence for instruction in the way of righteousness, was placed upon the Holy Scriptures, and the teaching of their ministers; for they did not believe in the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, as that Comforter, which was to lead the followers of Jesus Christ into all truth, and to bring all things to their remembrance.

His mind having been awakened to a lively concern relative to the great work of salvation, and being earnestly engaged in seeking after the knowledge of those things which belonged to his soul's peace, he found the insufficiency of all those means, which he had formerly depended upon, as the only medium of right instruction. In this state, it pleased the Lord to reveal himself to him, by his Holy Spirit, and to give him a clear sight of the inward work of regeneration; and by yielding in obedience to the manifestations of divine light, he was brought to see, that although a mere literal acquaintance with the sacred volume could not save the soul, yet when it was opened by that Holy Spirit, under whose divine inspiration and direction it was written, it was not only profitable for doctrine, correction, reproof, and instruction in righteousness, but through faith, which is in Christ Jesus, able to make wise unto salvation. He thus writes—

“I, with many more, was under that mistake that the Jews were in, who thought they might have Eternal Life in the Scriptures; Christ saith, John v. 39, Search, or ye search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have Eternal Life, and they are they which testify of me, and ye will not come to me that ye might have life. As *he is the life, so he is the way to the Father; I am the way, and the truth.*

and the life: *no man cometh unto the Father but by me.* John xiv. 6. As for the scriptures, I was a great lover, and a great reader of them, and took great pleasure in *searching* of them, thinking that would make me wise unto salvation, as Paul said to Timothy, and that from a child thou hast known the scriptures, *which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith, which is in Christ Jesus.* 2 Tim. iii. 15. *This main thing* was wanting, the true and saving faith, which is the gift of God. It is by grace we are saved, through faith, not of ourselves, it is the gift of God. Ephes. ii. 8. So it is the grace of God that brings salvation, and not *the bare historical* knowledge of the scriptures.

“Too many take a great deal of pride in a *literal knowledge* of them; some for their gain and profit; others take pleasure in them, *by wresting them to vindicate their false and erroneous opinions*, that gender to strife and contention, and take little or no notice of that meek, holy, and lovely spirit of life, *that gave them forth*, for they are of no private interpretation; but *holy men of God spake them, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.* 2 Pet. i. 20, 21.

“Men may have a great literal knowledge of the scriptures, and yet remain in error, because *they know them not as they ought to do*, nor the power that was in the holy men that gave them forth; so I may say, as Christ said to the Jews, *You err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God.* Matt. xxii. 29. So that which gives the true knowledge of God, and a right understanding of the scriptures, is the power of God; and I may say with the apostle, ‘For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, *in the face of Jesus Christ,* 2 Corin. iv. 6. And as men and women come to mind this light, that is, the Spirit of God, and to obey it, they *shall come to the comfort of the Scriptures*, as the same apostle says, “For *whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience, and comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope,* Rom. xv. 4.

“And being under a serious consideration of what I read in the Scripture, believing the Spirit of the Lord to be the interpreter thereof, *those great mysteries*, that were hid from ages and generations, and *are hid now* in this our age from many, are come to be revealed by the Spirit of God; and if they would have comfort in reading the Scriptures, they must wait in that *measure* of the spirit, which God hath given them, which is the only key that opens them to the understanding of those, that are truly conscientious in the reading of them; and though I read them formerly, as many do now, without a true sense and a due consideration, *yet now I can bless God for them, and have a great comfort in the reading of them*; they being no more as a sealed book unto me, and many more who wait for the assistance of God’s holy Spirit, in all their duties and performances, that the Lord requires of them, for without him we know that we can do nothing that is pleasing unto him: though formerly we ran, in our own time and wills, to preach and pray, not having such a due regard to the leading and moving of the Spirit of the Lord; yet I bless God it is not so now.”—Pages 12, 13, 14.

Thus this worthy man, instead of lessening the true value of the inspired writings, gives them a very exalted character, as proceeding from the immediate revelation of the Holy Ghost, and when read under its guidance, proving a comfort and encouragement to the humble christian ; for which inestimable blessing he could truly bless God.

CHAPTER XIV.

Quotations from ROBERT BARCLAY'S Apology.

AMONG the many amiable and pious characters, which adorned the Society of Friends, in the period of its infancy, and who were eminently useful under the divine blessing, in promoting a knowledge of those precious truths, which were then peculiar to the Quakers, there were few more honourably distinguished than Robert Barclay.

His extensive natural endowments, had been cultivated and improved by a liberal education; and very early in life, he yielded to the secret, though powerful influences of heavenly grace, by which they were sanctified, and prepared for extraordinary service, in the glorious cause of the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. He joined in religious communion with the Society of Friends about the year 1667, when in the 19th year of his age; and a gift of the gospel ministry being committed to his trust, he was for many years actively engaged in the exercise of it, as well as in writing in defence of the principles and practices, of the Society of which he was a member. He suffered much for his religion, being frequently imprisoned and otherwise cruelly persecuted, but he endured all with christian patience and resignation, esteeming it all joy to be accounted worthy to suffer for his crucified Lord and Saviour.—He died in 1690, in the 42d year of his age.

Robert Barclay was the author of a number of valuable works. His Apology for the true Christian Divinity, &c. and his Catechism and Confession of Faith, are doctrinal treatises of the highest authority, both among ancient and modern Friends. The Apology is indeed, the most comprehensive and complete exposition and defence of the christian faith of the Quakers, and the grounds upon which they dissent from other denominations of religious professors, which has ever been published. To show the high esteem in which it was held by the founders of the Society, we shall quote a part of the excellent preface to his works, written by William Penn, viz.

“I am now come to his elaborate apology, published in 1675, entitled, “An Apology for the true Christian Divinity, as the same is *held forth and preached* by the people called in scorn *Quakers*, &c. dedicated to King Charles the Second.” It was the most *comprehensive* of all his pieces, published in Latin, Dutch and English, and at least twice printed in our own tongue. It came out at the close of a long and sharp engagement between us, of this kingdom, and a confederacy of adversaries of almost all persuasions. It was his happiness both to live in a more retired corner, and to enjoy at that time, a space of quiet above his brethren: which, with the conside-

ration of their three or four years toil, and a sense of service in himself, put him upon undertaking and publishing this discourse, as an *essay towards the prevention of future controversy*. It first lays down, *our avowed principles of belief and practice*, distinguished from *what our enemies are pleased to say in our names*, who by *making us erroneous*, give themselves the easier task to confute us; and then triumph. After he has stated *our principles*, he has put the objections which he had collected out of our adversaries' books, or that he did apprehend might be made, to those principles; and answers them: and lastly cites divers authors, both ancient and modern, especially some of the primitive ages, for further illustration, and confirmation of *our said belief and practice*.

"The method and style of the book, may be somewhat singular, and like a scholar; for we make that sort of learning no part of our divine science. But that was not to show himself, but out of his tenderness to scholars, and as far as this simplicity and purity of the truth would permit, in condescension to their education, and way of treating of those points, herein handled; observing the Apostle's example of becoming all unto all, (where there was nothing in himself to forbid it,) that he might win some. In fine, *the book says so much for us*, and itself too, that I need say the less; but recommend it to *thy serious perusal*, reader, as that which may be instrumental, with God's blessing, to *inform thy understanding, confirm thy belief, and comfort thy mind*, about the excellent things of God's kingdom. *To be sure, thou wilt meet with the abused and disguised Quaker, in his own shape, complexion, and proper dress*; so that if thou art not one of them, thou needest not longer follow common fame or prejudice, against a people, though afflicted from the first, yet not forsaken, to this day: Ever blessed, be the name of the most High God, for he is good, for his mercy endures forever."—Preface, pages 21, 23.

To this preface, is added the following testimony, viz:

"According to that true and sincere love in the Lord, which we had to our dear brother, Robert Barclay, and christian respect which lives in us, to his blessed memory, and our real esteem and value of his faithful testimony, great industry, and labour of love, for promoting the ever living truth as it is in Christ, in his day and time: We, whose names are under-written, *do sincerely own, and have satisfaction and unity in truth*, with this foregoing preface and relation, in the behalf of him, the said Robert Barclay, and his great and memorable service, labours, and travels, in the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; *to whom*, be the glory and dominion for ever!

"George Whitehead, Patrick Livingston, Alexander Seaton, Benjamin Antrobus, Francis Stamper, John Vaughton, and John Field.

"London, 15th of 7th mo. 1691."

George Fox in his testimony concerning him, says:

"A testimony, concerning our dear brother in the Lord, Robert Barclay, who was a wise and faithful minister of Christ, *and writ many precious books, in the defence of the truth* in English and Latin, and after translated into French and Dutch. He was a scholar, and a man of great parts, and underwent many calumnies, slanders and

reproaches and sufferings for the name of Christ; but the Lord gave him power over them all."

William Penn, in his "testimony to the memory of R. Barclay," has these observations—

"He was much exercised in controversy, from the many contradictions that fell upon the truth, and upon him for its sake, in his own country chiefly, in which he *ever acquitted himself with honour to the truth; particularly by his apology for the christian divinity professed by the people called Quakers. which contains a collection of our principles, our enemies' objections, and our answers, augmented and illustrated, closely and amply, with many authorities for confirmation. Also his book of church government, distinguishing between tyranny and anarchy, imposition and lawlessness, occasioned by the scruples of some, and partialities of others, that had a tendency to a division among us: They are standing books of sound judgment, and good service to the truth and church of God. Nor must his Scripture Catechism be forgotten, in that it opens the mind of truth, upon points of doctrine, in the words of the Holy Ghost; excluding all human glosses or interpretation; which is an easy, safe, and peaceable method, the tendency of it, being, to silence, and commend the curiosity of man to the text, WHICH ALL OWNS; and there leave controversy, as the best method to unity and peace, next that of the spirit itself.* And indeed, it was exactly suitable to his own disposition, that preferred truth before victory, and peace and unity, before niceties, and a good life before worldly learning."

Patrick Livingston, says of him:

"Both as to the inward and outward, he was a blameless man in his conversation; and he was both *solid, sound, and comprehensive in his writings. And as for his doctrine he was plain and clear to the meanest capacity, discreet and obliging therein.*"

Andrew Jaffray, makes these remarks:

"He was a man that laid out himself *in the ability of the large understanding given him, to set forth the beauty, and infallibility of the grounds, and excellent principles of truth, and to open and prove the same over all opposition of gainsayers, to the reaching of the understanding of many of the great and learned of the world, both at home and abroad, and to the begetting a better opinion and judgment, concerning both the principles and practices of God's people, (called in derision Quakers,) than had been held forth by the craft and malice of the priests and others, to be in the beginning, as fools, madmen, &c., and holding nonsensical and unreasonable, as well as unscriptural whimsies, &c.*"

Speaking of the doctrine of the influence of the Holy Spirit, he says: "Which is our testimony and holy principle we direct all unto; and which *this blessed servant of the church, laid out himself in his many excellent writings, (especially his Apology,) to promulgate through the world, with blessed success, not only in printing, but in travelling, having gone through a great part of Germany, Holland, and other countries, in the service of the truth: And the Lord blessed him every way therein.*"

These excellent testimonies, evince both how highly the individ-

ual was esteemed, and what full credit and authority his writings obtained among those who were the earliest ministers and labourers in the Society of Friends. From the time the Apology was first printed down to the present period, it has been repeatedly sanctioned by the Society in its collective capacity, both in England and America, and appealed to, as containing the best and most approved declaration of their christian belief. It was first printed in 1675, and in 1705, had reached the fifth edition in English, beside several in Latin, French, and Dutch, &c. It was written soon after the Society was settled, and referred to by the early Quakers for information concerning their principles, and its language quoted in their defence against the accusations of invidious enemies. This book has now passed through more than twelve editions in our own tongue, beside being translated and published in many foreign languages; and from the universal credit which it has ever obtained from the Society, collectively, and all those who were in unity with it; from the pains they have been at in circulating it; from its full acknowledgment by the early Quakers, and repeated sanctions by their successors, it is evident that no book ever printed by them, is so justly entitled to the character of "A confession and defence of their faith, doctrines, and religious practices."

If the doctrines of Elias Hicks were really coincident with those of the early Quakers, the compilers need have gone no further for proof of it than Barclay's Apology. As this contains the tenets of true Friends, both ancient and modern, they might have saved themselves the trouble of searching over their controversial and occasional essays, and culling from so many volumes, the fragments which bore the semblance of authority for their notions. But the friends of Elias Hicks are well aware, that Barclay is too clear and christian a writer, too plain and positive in his assertion of the principles of Quakerism, and too cogent and scriptural in his arguments to establish them, to serve as authority for their dogmas. Unwilling, however, to lose the name of so distinguished and learned a writer, and probably fearing that the entire omission of so generally received and authentic a work, as the Apology, might excite some well founded suspicions that they did not acknowledge it—they have given place to some quotations on the subject of the scriptures, and the spiritual body and blood of our blessed Lord. We shall be able to show the reader, that these quotations are made with great unfairness, and do not exhibit, by any means, the faith of this society upon the points to which they relate.

The first proof of a want of candour in the compilers, is the entire omission of the whole of Barclay's proposition relative to the Holy Scriptures, which contains his declaration of what the Quakers believe them to be, and what they are not; and the introduction to his argument, where he states at how high a rate they value them. The compilers then insert a considerable part of the argument, where he is showing, that the Holy Scriptures are not the primary rule of faith and life, which the Quakers have never believed they were. In doing this they have mutilated his sentences, and omitted parts of paragraphs explanatory of his meaning, so as greatly to obscure

the true design of the author. We shall insert some of the parts which they have omitted. The proposition, and introduction to the argument are as follows. After speaking of the inward, immediate revelations of the Holy Spirit, he says—

“ Proposition third, concerning the scriptures.

“ From these revelations of the Spirit of God to the saints, have proceeded, the scriptures of truth, which contain,

“ I. A *faithful* historical account of the actings of God’s people in divers ages; with many singular and remarkable providences attending them.

“ II. A prophetic account of several things, whereof some are already past, and some yet to come.

“ III. A full and ample account of all the chief principles of the doctrine of Christ, held forth in divers precious declarations, exhortations and sentences, which by the moving of God’s spirit, were at several times, and upon sundry occasions, spoken and written unto some churches and their pastors.

“ Nevertheless, because they are only a declaration of the fountain, and not the fountain itself, therefore they are not to be esteemed the *principal* ground of all truth and knowledge, nor yet the *adequate, primary rule*, of faith and manners. Yet because they give a *true and faithful testimony*, of the first foundation, *they are and may be esteemed, a secondary rule*, subordinate to the Spirit, from which they have all their excellency and certainty: for as by the inward testimony of the Spirit we do alone truly know them, so they testify, that the Spirit is that guide, by which the saints are led into all truth; therefore according to the scriptures, the spirit is the first and principle leader. Seeing then that we do therefore receive and believe the scriptures because they proceeded from the Spirit, for the very same reason, is the Spirit more originally and principally the rule, according to the received maxim in the schools, *Propter quod unumquodque est tale, illud ipsum est magis tale*: that for which a thing is such, that thing itself is more such.”

He then proceeds to the argument, viz:—1st, “ The former part of this proposition, though it needs no apology for itself, yet it is a good apology for us, and *will help to sweep away, that, among many other calumnies*, wherewith we are often loaded, *as if we were vilifiers and deniers of the scriptures*; for in that which we affirm of them, it doth appear at what high rate we value them, accounting them without all deceit, or equivocation, *the most excellent writings in the world*; to which not only no other writings are to be preferred, but even in divers respects *not comparable thereto*. For as we freely acknowledge, that *their authority doth not depend* upon the approbation or canons of any church or assembly; so NEITHER CAN WE SUBJECT THEM TO THE FALLEN, CORRUPT, AND DEFILED REASON OF MAN: and therein as we do freely agree with the Protestants, against the error of the Romanists, so on the other hand, we cannot go the length of such Protestants, as make their authority to depend upon any virtue or power that is in the writings themselves; but we desire to ascribe all to that Spirit from which they proceeded.”—Pages 81, 82.

We should not have supposed, that Robert Barclay would have been produced at the present day, as authority for supporting that calumny of which he here complains, viz : that the Quakers vilified and denied the scriptures ; or that the compilers could have omitted to notice this full assertion of the belief of the Society of Friends in their divine original, authenticity and authority ; and incomparable superiority over all other books in the world. Such, however, is the case ; without even noticing this, the compilers ungenerously commence with the next paragraph, take in six lines, stop at a semicolon ; then omit two pages—take in about half of page 85, then omit the statement of the nature of the argument, viz : that they are not the *principal ground of faith and knowledge* ; pass over to page 86 ; take in about four lines and stop at a colon, omitting a sentence explanatory of R. Barclay's views, which concludes a paragraph ; then on page 87 omit seventeen words at the beginning of the next paragraph ; and commence where there is no stop in the sentence, take in about one third of the page, leave out the remainder and go to page 88, take in about nine lines, then pass over to page 93, take about half a page, then omit eight lines and begin after a comma, taking in the remainder of page 93, and about four lines on page 94, then omit nine lines, and resume the quotation which is continued to page 97, where they close their extracts.

The several parts of this mangled extract, are placed in immediate succession to each other, as though they were regularly connected in the author's treatise, without any mark which would denote that any intervening parts are left out, and punctuated and divided into paragraphs as though they regularly commenced after, and closed with a full period. We leave our readers to judge for themselves how far such quotations as these can be considered as authority for the sentiments of Robert Barclay, or the early Quakers ; they need but little comment since every upright man must see that by such means, an author may be made to speak almost any sentiments.

Immediately succeeding the paragraph with which the compilers close, we have the following, viz :

§ V. " If it be then asked me, Whether I think hereby to render the scriptures altogether uncertain or useless ? I answer ; Not at all. The proposition itself declares how much I esteem them ; and provided, that to the Spirit from which, they came, be but granted, that place, the scriptures themselves give it ; *I do freely concede to the scriptures the second place*, even whatsoever they say of themselves, which the apostle Paul chiefly mentions in two places, Romans xv. 4, Whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope. 2d Tim. iii. 15; 16, 17, The holy scriptures are able to make wise unto salvation through faith, which is in Jesus. Christ All scripture given by inspiration of God, is profitable for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work."

Robert Barclay then proceeds to describe the several ways in which Christians may derive benefit from the pious perusal of the sacred volume; and after asserting that the society are ever willing to have all their doctrines and practices tried by them, he considers the various texts adduced by other protestant professors, to prove that they are the only and primary rule of faith and manners. In his ninth section, he thus replies to an objection:

“The last, and that which at first view seems to be the greatest objection, is this:

“If the scripture be not the adequate, principal, and only rule, then it would follow that the scripture is not complete, nor the canon filled; that if men be now immediately led and ruled by the spirit, they may add new scriptures of equal authority with the old, whereas every one that adds is cursed: yea, what assurance have we, but, at this rate, every one may bring in a new gospel, according to his fancy?

“The *dangerous consequences* insinuated in this objection, were fully answered in the latter part of the last proposition, in what was said a little before, offering freely to *disclaim all pretended revelations* contrary to the scripture.

“Objection 1.—But if it be urged, that it is not enough to deny these consequences, if they naturally follow from your doctrine of immediate revelation, and denying the scripture to be the *only rule*:

“I answer, we have proved both these doctrines to be true and necessary according to the scriptures themselves; and therefore, to fasten evil consequences upon them, which we make appear do not follow, is not to accuse us, but Christ and his apostles, who preached them. But, secondly, we have shut the door upon all such doctrine in this very position, affirming that the scriptures give a full and ample testimony, to all the principal doctrines of the Christian faith. For we do *firmly believe that there is no other gospel or doctrine to be preached, but that which was delivered by the apostles*; and do *freely subscribe* to that saying, *let him that preacheth any other gospel than that which hath been already preached by the apostles, and according to the scriptures, be accursed*.

“So we distinguish betwixt a *revelation of a new gospel and new doctrines*, and a new revelation of the good old gospel and doctrines; the last we plead for, *but the first we utterly deny*. For we firmly believe that ‘no other foundation can any man lay than that which is laid already.’ But that this revelation is necessary we have already proved; and this distinction doth sufficiently guard us against the hazard insinuated in the objection.”—Apology, pages 104, 105.

Barclay then goes into the consideration of the question, whether the scripture be a filled canon or not, which concludes the chapter.

Our readers will at once perceive, that while this excellent man, and able theologian, contended firmly against the erroneous idea, that the Holy Scriptures are the only, or the primary rule of faith and life; he does positively assert, on behalf of the Society of Friends, that they *utterly renounce and deny all pretensions to the revelation of any new doctrine*; that the sacred volume contains *all doctrines necessary in common to be believed*, and that they *freely*

subscribe to the saying, let him that preacheth any other gospel than that which hath been already preached by the apostles, and according to the scriptures, be accursed.

This doctrine the society has again and again sanctioned, both in England and America, and given it their approbation in the most unequivocal manner; and consequently, as Elias Hicks and his friends *do teach doctrines which directly contradict the Holy Scriptures*, it follows that they are not one in faith with the Society of Friends, ancient or modern.

On page 66, of the compilers' pamphlet, we have three short quotations, from the second section, of the thirteenth proposition and argument of the Apology, which treats of the "communion, or participation of the body and blood of Christ." We are at a loss to discover what object the compilers had, in selecting these passages, unless it be to make it appear, that R. Barclay denied the manhood of Jesus Christ. But whatever might have been the design, it is certain that the quotations are made very unfairly, as will appear from the following extracts, in which the parts selected by them, are enclosed in brackets with a hand. The second proposition thus commences:

"§ II. [The body,] then. [of Christ, which believers partake of, is spiritual and not carnal; and his blood which they drink of, is pure and heavenly,] and not human or elementary, as Augustin also affirms of the body of Christ which is eaten, in his Tractat Psal. xcvi. Except a man eat my flesh, he hath not in him life eternal; and he saith, The words which I speak unto you, are spirit and life; understand spiritually what I have spoken. Ye shall not eat of this body which ye see, and drink this blood which they shall spill, which crucify me. I am the living bread, who have descended from Heaven. He calls himself the bread, who descended from Heaven, exhorting that we might believe in him, &c.

"If it be asked then, What that body, what that flesh and blood is?

"I answer; [It is that heavenly seed, that divine, spiritual, celestial substance, of which we spake before, in the fifth and sixth propositions.] This is that spiritual body of Christ, whereby and through which, he communiceth life to men, and salvation to as many as believe in him, and receive him; and whereby also, man comes to have fellowship and communion with God."—page 460.

The first sentence which the compilers have taken, comprises about three lines of the Apology, and closes at a comma—this they have pointed with a period, and omitting twelve lines, take in about three lines more, in the next paragraph, joining the two together as though regularly connected in the Apology, and appearing in their pamphlet as one continuous quotation.

R. Barclay, then proceeds to recite the principal part of the sixth chapter of John, from verse 32 to the end, and to explain and apply it to the communion of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus, which the saints partake of. Having done this, he draws the following conclusion, a part of which the compilers quote, viz :

[From] this large description of [the origin, nature, and effects, of this body, flesh, and blood of Christ, it is apparent that it is spiritual, and to be understood of a spiritual body, and not of that body, or temple of Jesus Christ, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and in which he walked, lived, and suffered, in the land of Judea;] because it is said, that it came down from Heaven; yea, that it is HE that came down from Heaven. Now all christians at present, generally acknowledge, that the *outward* body of Christ came not down from Heaven; neither was it that part of Christ which came down from Heaven. And to put the matter out of doubt, when the carnal Jews, would have been so understanding; he tells them plainly, verse 63, It is the spirit that quickeneth, but the flesh profiteth nothing.

[This is also founded upon most sound and solid reason; because it is the soul, not the body, that is to be nourished by this flesh and blood. Now, outward flesh cannot nourish nor feed the soul; there is no proportion nor analogy betwixt them; neither is the communion of the saints with God, by a conjunction and mutual participation of flesh, but of spirit:] he that is joined to the Lord, is one spirit, not one flesh."—page 462.

R. Barclay, then goes on to explain the subject further, and to draw a distinction between the spiritual flesh and blood and body of Christ, and that body of outward flesh which he took from the Virgin Mary, in which the Word of God appeared and was manifested. This distinction of spiritual and fleshly bodies, is the most that can be inferred from the sentences, which the compilers have mutilated, and since R. Barclay acknowledges in one of them, the miraculous conception of our blessed Lord, it furnishes us with another instance of disagreement between him and Elias Hicks, the latter affirming that the scripture testimony proves Jesus Christ to be the son of Joseph.

To show clearly, that Barclay was a firm believer in all that the scriptures set forth, concerning the coming, and suffering, and death, &c., of the Son of God, (though this has already been sufficiently evinced from his declarations respecting the sacred volume,) we shall insert the following paragraph from his proposition on universal and saving light. After largely enforcing the necessity and sufficiency of the Holy Spirit graciously vouchsafed to all men, the author adds:

“§ XV. Fourthly.—We do not hereby intend, any ways, to lessen or derogate from the atonement and sacrifice of Jesus Christ; but on the contrary, *do magnify and exalt it.* For as we believe all those things to have been certainly transacted, which are recorded in the Holy Scriptures, concerning the birth, life, miracles, sufferings, resurrection, and ascension of Christ; so we do also believe, that it is the duty of every one to believe it, to whom it pleases God to reveal the same, and to bring to them the knowledge of it; yea, we believe it were damnable unbelief, not to believe it, when so declared; but to resist that holy seed, which as minded would lead and incline every one to believe it, as it is offered unto them, though it revealeth not in every one, the outward and explicit knowledge of

it, nevertheless it *always* assenteth to it, where it is declared. Nevertheless as we firmly believe it was necessary, that Christ should come, that by his death and sufferings, he might offer up himself a sacrifice to God for our sins, who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, so we BELIEVE THAT THE REMISSION OF SINS WHICH ANY PARTAKE OF, IS ONLY IN AND BY VIRTUE OF THAT MOST SATISFACTORY SACRIFICE, AND NO OTHERWISE. For it is by the obedience of that one, that the free gift is come upon all, to justification. For we affirm, that as all men partake of the fruit of Adam's fall, in that, by reason of that evil seed, which, through him, is communicated unto them, they are prone and inclined unto evil, though thousands of thousands be ignorant of Adam's fall, neither ever knew of the eating of the forbidden fruit; so also many may come to feel the influence of this holy and divine seed and light, and be turned from evil to good by it, though they knew nothing of Christ's coming in the flesh, *through whose obedience* and sufferings it is purchased unto them. And as we affirm it is absolutely needful, that those do believe the history of Christ's outward appearance, whom it pleased God to bring to the knowledge of it; so we do freely confess, that *even that outward knowledge*, is very comfortable to such as are subject to, and led by, the inward seed and light. For not only doth the sense of Christ's love and sufferings tend to humble them, but they are thereby also strengthened in their faith, and encouraged to follow that excellent pattern, which he hath left us, who suffered for us, as saith the apostle Peter, 1 Pet. ii. 21, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps: and many times we are greatly edified and refreshed, with the gracious sayings which proceed out of his mouth. The history then is profitable and comfortable with the mystery, and never without it; but the mystery is, and may be profitable, without the explicit and outward knowledge of the history."—pages 155, 156.

CHAPTER XIV.

Observations on the extracts from the writings of FRANCIS HOWGILL.

The compilers have inserted on their 69th page, a quotation from a controversial essay, written by Francis Howgill, by which it would seem, they wish to make it appear, that this author considered the saints to be equal with God. We have already replied to a similar charge alleged against George Fox; and have proved from the evidence of his cotemporary Friends, that he meant far otherwise, than his enemies pretended; and that the early Quakers never professed so blasphemous a doctrine.

Francis Howgill does not assert, that the saints are equal with God, but that they are *in* that, which is *one in nature* with him. He quotes the language of the apostle, "He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit," and adds, "*there is unity, and the unity stands in equality itself.*" It is evident from the manner in which he uses the term, that he means no more by *equality* than *oneness in nature*, and this is further shown in the subsequent sentence. "He that is born from above," says he, "is the Son of God; and *he said, I and my Father are one.* And when the Son is revealed and speaks, the Father speaks in him, and dwells in him, and he in the Father." The compilers have here, as in the paragraph from George Fox, on the same subject, omitted the usual form of commencing the word Son, (when applied to our blessed Lord,) with a capital letter, doubtless intending to make it apply to those who are called sons of God by adoption. But it will be seen that Francis Howgill prevents this construction of his expression, by using the past tense, "*Who said,*" and reciting the express words of our Lord, which proves that he alluded to him only. Francis Howgill adds, "Is that which is equal; *IN* equality itself; there is equality *in nature*, though not *in stature.*"

The intention of the author in these expressions, appears to be in consonance with that saying of our blessed Saviour, "I am the vine, ye are the branches, and my Father is the husbandman. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye except ye abide in me." Hence every true disciple of the Lord Jesus, must abide *in him*—and he that abides *in him*, in Christ, is in *that*, which is equal with God, for said he, "I and my Father are One." But Francis Howgill is careful to distinguish between *equality in nature* and *equality in degree*, and in the former sense only, he uses it when applied to the saints; and *in both* when speaking of Jesus Christ. The same passage as the compilers have quoted in their pamphlet, was adduced by the Snake, to prove that Francis Howgill, equalled himself with God. The reader may see the reply, in Joseph Wyeth's Switch, p. 60.

Page 72 of the pamphlet, we have a quotation from Francis Howgill's works, which seems to be highly valued by the compilers, as they have printed a part of it in large capitals. It is upon the subject of understanding what we believe; and we cannot but smile at their want of perception in construing it into a defence of their great axiom, that *man's reason is to comprehend the mysteries of religion*. As they have garbled the passage in order to make it favour their notions, we shall quote the whole paragraph and doubt not but we shall convince every man, of common understanding and candour, that Francis Howgill is writing *against* the very notion, which they quote this mutilated sentence, to support. This extract is, as usual, enclosed in brackets.

The essay from which it is taken, is entitled, "The true rule, judge, and guide, of the true Church of God, borne testimony unto, what it is, and wherein it consisteth." This was written in reply to a treatise by Robert Everard, in which the latter asserted, that as "all dissenting judgments grant there must be a way, and a rule, appointed to teach us, to decide all doubts, to judge of all matters, and to teach us the true way to heaven with certainty; but who this rule or judge is; is not agreed upon by all;" he has collected the different opinions respecting it, into four heads—"First, Some set up the Spirit to direct them, and to be this means—Secondly, another will have every man's *own natural reason to be this rule and judge*. Thirdly, others will set up *sole scripture*. And the fourth, assigns the Holy Catholic Church to be that Judge and director."

Robert Everard argues against either of the first three, being that rule, and establishes, as he thinks, "the fourth to be that way, and rule, and judge, and governing power, to decide all doubts, as that whereby all are obliged to submit unto, as to Christ himself." He states that he always esteemed the Quaker's *light*, to be the spirit, or natural reason; but which, he did not know; and therefore this being the point in which he wished satisfaction, he waved all controversy respecting their doctrines, and confined his observations and inquiries to this one subject. Francis Howgill replies to his arguments severally: On page 634, he says—

"The next thing which Robert Everard saith he considered, was, That the *natural reason* of every man, could not possibly be the rule and judge that I sought for; for, (saith he,) if reason were to be rule and judge, then it would follow, contrary to scripture, that it's *not impossible* to please God *without faith*, and it would likewise follow, that every religion would be truth, consequently, contradictions would be true, consequently, there would be many religions, and no faith all, for reason excludes faith as in the 26th page of his [Robert Everard's] book. To this Francis Howgill answers:—

"Thy tongue is thy own, and thou art at liberty and goest whither thou wilt, and speakest what seems good in thy own eyes, and hast never yet known *another* to gird thee, and lead thee whither thou wouldst not; I stand not to vindicate every *man's judgment*, neither to prove other men's conceptions; but seeing thou hast taken in hand to lay all mountains waste before thee; that stand in thy ways, thou hast raised up some in thy discourse for others to stumble at, and

hast spoken many false things without distinguishing, and putting a difference between light and darkness, between natural reason and spiritual reason, I could not choose but say somewhat.

“Although it is no part of my belief that the natural reason of any man, or every man, is able to be rule, judge, and guide to any man in the things of God; yet faith is not in opposition unto pure reason, neither is pure and spiritual reason in opposition to true faith, but in harmony with it, and one with another, as they are the gifts of God; but the natural reason of all the fallen sons of Adam is corrupted, and is too short and too narrow, too cross, and too perverse to be rule and judge in the things of God; for the natural man by all his endowments, in the transgression, perceives not the things of God, for they are spiritually discerned, and the things of God, that are spiritual and eternal, ARE ABOVE THE REACH OF NATURAL REASON, and yet thy consequence is false, for faith doth not exclude pure reason; and faith doth not make blind the understanding but enlightens it, and though it is impossible to please God without faith, yet it is impossible, that that faith should be without reason; the apostle desired to be delivered from unreasonable men, that had not faith, so it is manifest, they that have faith have reason, and they that have no faith, are unreasonable: And [where thou hast borrowed this “rule I know not, that a man must believe that he doth not understand, seeing the Apostle saith to the Romans, even of the Gentiles, who had not the law nor the scripture, ‘that that which may be known of God was manifest in them: for by that it is manifest, they understood the mind of God, and knew him; for Paul saith further, when they knew God they glorified him not as God, but were unthankful, &c.; and again he that believes, must know that God is, for none can believe in that which is not; for, to persuade any to believe in uncertainties which are not manifest is the understanding, doth rather beget unbelief and doubting, than true faith,] but thy paths, are so full of darkness, I shall not traduce them, and thy consequences are false; for pure reason teacheth not contradictions, neither doth teach that there is no faith at all. neither is faith excluded by pure reason, as thou ignorantly sayest in the 26th page; and is it not reason, that I should believe in him, whom I know is the Creator, and Governor of all the world; and pure religion is so far from excluding faith, that they that have true faith have reason, and stand not in opposition to faith; but this I conclude, that the reason of fallen men is corrupted and is an uncertain thing to rely upon, and so not a competent judge in matters of so high concernment, as touching everlasting salvation.”

It must require but a very moderate share of discernment, to enable any candid reader, to perceive the true meaning of Francis Howgill in this argument. The author against whom he was contending, being a member of the Church of Rome, lays it down as a maxim, that every thing propounded by her, as an article of faith, however absurd and contradictory to revelation and pure reason, is to be believed, upon the credit of her infallibility; therefore he rejects all other rules for judging controversies or doctrines, but her dictum. This notion Francis Howgill contends against as false and antichristian

In replying to the argument of Robert Everard, he censures him, for not distinguishing between *light* and *darkness*, *natural* reason and *spiritual* reason, which is to say, that though spiritual reason is light, yet natural reason is darkness. He then declares that it is *no part* of his belief, that the *natural reason of any man, is able to be rule, judge and guide to any man* in the things of God. Now if not the natural reason of *any man*, then, not the natural reason *even of the saints*, is adequate to this great business, of judging in the things of God, and consequently something *higher than reason is essentially necessary*, to lead us aright in the mysteries of religion.

To prove his assertion that natural reason is not adequate, he says it is "too short and too narrow," as well as "too cross and too perverse, to be rule and judge in the things of God." If it is too short and too narrow, then it *is not able to comprehend* those things of God, which it is necessary for man to know in order to salvation, and a *more comprehensive and noble principle is necessary* to guide, and govern, and direct. If a man is to believe those things of God, which *natural reason is too short and too narrow to comprehend*, which Francis Howgill asserts; then man is to believe what his natural reason *cannot comprehend* or judge of, and hence it is that he adds, "for the *natural man, by all his endowments*, in the transgression, *perceives not the things of God, for they are spiritually discerned.*" If then man, *by all his endowments, perceives not the things of God*, consequently, *reason, though ever so much cultivated*, is incapable of *discerning* or *comprehending* them; and must remain forever ignorant of them, unless they are opened by that spirit of truth, which *alone* is able to unfold the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven.

But we have yet a more positive declaration from Francis Howgill of the incapacity of human reason, to scan the deep things of God. In the same sentence he says, "*the things of God, that are spiritual and eternal, are above the reach of natural reason;*" now if they are above the reach of natural reason, it follows that *natural reason cannot comprehend* nor understand them; therefore, if they are believed, as they must be, in order to salvation, a man must *believe what his reason cannot comprehend*.

But Francis Howgill says it is a false inference to conclude from hence, that *faith excludes reason*; which is certainly true, since, if man had not reason, that noble faculty which distinguishes him from the inferior orders of the animal creation, he could not have faith. But this is a truth not at all connected with the axiom of unbelief, that a man must not believe what he cannot comprehend.

If we believe that God is a God of truth, that he is ever unchangeably the same, then it is perfectly *consistent with pure reason*, that we should *implicitly believe whatever he is pleased to reveal to us*, because we know that he cannot lie. Hence, faith does not exclude pure reason, but is in harmony with it, though the truth which he reveals, and which we thus receive, and believe, in consequence of our *faith in Him*, may be *utterly incomprehensible* by our own puny powers. Thus God has seen meet to reveal to us that he is an eternal,

self-existent, uncreated being; without beginning and without end; infinite in all glorious attributes and perfections: omniscient and omnipresent; and that all time, past, present, and to come, is *ever present* with him, and open to his view. Now if we have *faith in Him*, that faith which is his own blessed gift, we must reverently assent to all this; we must believe him to be what he has declared he is; and in humility we can worship and adore him as such; but yet *we cannot comprehend* even one of these, his exalted attributes; nor with all our puny powers have the least adequate idea of it. He is infinitely exalted above all our finite conceptions and narrow powers of comprehension, higher than the heavens are above the earth; and yet it *is reasonable*. nay, *it is our indispensable duty to believe* not only that *he is*, but that *he is, what he has declared himself to be*.

We now come to the consideration of that part of F. Howgill's argument which the compilers have extracted. He says to his opponent, "And where thou hast borrowed this rule, I know not, that a man must believe that he doth not understand." It is proper to notice, in the first place, that this rule was adduced by R. Everard, as a reason why people should assent to the absurd notions which the church of Rome propounded to the belief of her members, and to which she required their assent upon the bare credit of her assertion, however contradictory they might be to the doctrines of Holy Scripture, and the immediate revelation of the spirit of God.

In opposition to this, Francis Howgill says, "he knows not where he has borrowed this rule," and then gives, as a proof of the necessity of understanding what we believe, that "the apostle saith to the Romans, even of the gentiles, who had not the law, nor the scripture, that *that which may be known of God, was manifest in them.*" When we consider this explanation of what Francis Howgill intends, by "understanding what is believed," and compare it with his previous assertion, that the things of God are *above natural reason*, it must be evident that *he alludes only to that revelation* of the things of God, by the spirit of God, through which they were *made manifest* in the minds of the gentiles, as well as the Jews. He could not allude to comprehending them by *natural reason*; or coming to know them, through that medium, else he would thereby contradict his many positive assertions in the preceding and concluding parts of the same paragraph.

This is still more evident by what immediately follows the last sentence, viz. "for *by that*, it is manifest, they understood the mind of God, and knew him, for Paul saith further, 'when they knew God, they glorified him not as God but were unthankful,' &c. And again, he that believes, must know that God is, for none can believe in *that which is not.*"

Now to understand the mind of God, and know him, he has already declared, to be *beyond the reach of natural reason*: and consequently he cannot allude to this, as the means of their knowledge.—It is obvious too, that if reason had given them the knowledge of God, and of his will, the same reason would have taught them to obey it, whereas, though *they knew God, yet they glorified him not as God, but were unthankful.*

From the whole paragraph, it is clearly apparent, that when the author speaks of understanding, he means no more than that knowledge of any mystery, duty, or command, which through the revelation of the Holy Spirit, God is pleased to unfold to the mind of man, and make manifest there. And this he asserts, in opposition to the notion that we are to believe or practice things, contrary to reason and scripture, merely because the church of Rome has commanded them. He winds up the whole argument with this result: "but this I conclude, that *the reason of fallen men is corrupted, and is an uncertain thing to rely upon, and so NOT A COMPETENT JUDGE in matters of so high concernment as touching everlasting salvation.*"

The compilers have done great injustice to Francis Howgill, by mutilating the sentence, so as to force upon him, if possible, an opinion directly the reverse of that which he was contending for; and one which he declares to be *no part of his belief.*

In the course of the essay from which the extract is made, he asserts, that "they that teach a contrary doctrine to the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, they have the spirit of error; p. 635. "Again we have this to say, he that teacheth a contrary doctrine than that which was once delivered unto the saints, is a deceiver and deceived; and this was Christ's doctrine, once delivered unto the saints, &c." P. 631. Those who are now promulgating sentiments which are directly contradictory to the doctrines of Christ and his apostles, may perceive from this, how far F. H. is from coinciding with them; while these assertions, will fully acquit him from intending to insinuate that man by his own reason and wisdom may understand the mysteries of redemption, in direct opposition to the declarations of our blessed Lord, who said, they were hid from the wise and prudent of this world, and of the apostles, who declared the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God, and the world by wisdom knew not God.

In conclusion he declares, that Christ is the way to the Father and to the kingdom, the rule of his church and the Head by which it is governed, that he is the Lawgiver and Judge, for the Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son, who alone propounds truth sufficiently, and is the Author of true, living, saving faith.

CONCLUSION.

WE have now concluded our examination of the Extracts made by the Compilers, from the writings of our "primitive Friends;" and have proved by abundant and conclusive testimony, from the very authors whom they quote, that the alleged charge of coinciding with Elias Hicks, in denying the Three that bear record in heaven, the Divinity and Atonement of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and the authenticity, and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, is unfounded and untrue.

We have shown from the writings of the early Quakers, that when charged with holding the sentiments which Elias Hicks now avows, they promptly denied and repelled it as a false and malicious accusation; and we have presented to the reader, numerous declarations of faith, put forth by them, evincing in the clearest manner, their firm belief, in all the doctrines of the christian religion, as laid down by our blessed Lord and his apostles, in the sacred volume; from which it is apparent, that E. Hicks and his adherents, have widely swerved from the original principles "of our pious and enlightened predecessors."

In examining the extracts made by the compilers, we have had to notice many instances, where they have garbled or interpolated the writings, which they have quoted, so as to obscure, or entirely pervert, the true sense, and meaning of the authors. We cannot but view these unjustifiable liberties, as greatly beneath the true dignity of honest men, and the uprightness of the christian character, and as furnishing decisive proof, that they are advocating a cause, which cannot be defended by fair and honourable means; yet we are not so uncharitable, as to suppose that all those, who may be favourable to Elias Hicks, approve of the ungenerous means to which the compilers have resorted, in order to force upon the early Quakers, sentiments, which it is incontestibly evident, they never held.—We trust that the number who would thus identify themselves with such dishonourable practices, is very small—for we are persuaded that every liberal and enlightened mind, whatever may be its bias, in favour of the opinions which the compilers wish to support, will disclaim with noble indignation, any participation in such measures.

In treating upon the several points embraced in the pamphlet, to which we have replied, the sameness of the subjects rendered it impossible to avoid frequent repetition; but we apprehend, the peculiar circumstances of the case, will form a sufficient apology to the candid reader.—In making our extracts, we have been careful to omit no part, requisite to give a just view of the author's senti-

ments; and though the limits of the present volume, would not admit of the insertion of more than a small part, of the very abundant evidence, for the soundness of the doctrines of primitive Friends; yet we hope the quotations which we have exhibited, will not only satisfy our readers that they were real Christians, but excite them to a serious examination of their acknowledged doctrinal treatises; of which the most full and clear are Penn's Primitive Christianity Revived, his Key opening the way to distinguish between the Quaker's religion and the perversions of it, and his Testimony to the Truth, &c. and Barclay's Catechism and Apology.

From an extensive and careful research into the works of the early Quakers, we are fully satisfied, without the shadow of a doubt, that they were, what they ever professed to be, sincere and unfeigned believers, in all the doctrines of Holy Scripture, undeniably so, as regards those points which Elias Hicks now positively rejects; and that they were ever ready and willing to have *all their tenets* tried by the testimony of the Sacred volume. We fear not, but that we shall, on all occasions, be able to prove and establish this, in the most satisfactory manner, by the evidence of their own writings.

The compilers of the pamphlet inform us, that their extracts, "have been *carefully* transcribed and *compared*; if, however, [say they] *any alterations*, or inaccuracies, appear, *they are to be attributed solely to accident*, and not to design."

We appeal to the sober judgment of every upright man, whether this sentence, does not evince in the clearest manner, that they knew at the time they were printing the pamphlet, that they had unjustly altered the language of the primitive Friends; and were anxious by this flimsy apology, to screen themselves from the merited odium which such conduct must inevitably receive. We can readily attribute literal inaccuracies, and typographical errors to accident, and make every reasonable allowance for them, because we know, that even where much care is taken, they will frequently occur; but deliberately to assert, that *alterations*, and such alterations too, as the compilers have made, leaving out necessary parts of sentences, adding whole lines to the language of the writer, and by the most unfair garbling, entirely perverting the meaning of the text; to tell the public, that *these alterations "are to be attributed solely to accident, and not to design;"* is so palpable an instance of disregard to truth, as must put to the blush, every advocate for the cause in which they are engaged. Such *alterations could not possibly occur, by accident*, as the compilers well knew, when they were writing this sentence. They evince a deliberate design, to lay waste the christian character of the Society of Friends, and to fix the odious stigma of unbelief, upon those worthy and pious men, who were its original founders.

We doubt not, but the compilers have "carefully compared their extracts;" but we have shown enough in the present volume, to convince any one, that the care in comparing, has been taken, not to render them faithful delineations of the sentiments contained in

the originals, but to mutilate or alter them, so as to present the most favourable construction, in support of the sentiments of Elias Hicks. They seem themselves to have been fully aware of this, and as if to deprecate the just retribution of censure and contempt, which they knew must await detection, they put in the plea of *accident*. The alterations say they, occurred by accident. But surely, this is adding effrontery to unfairness. What opinion would a judicial tribunal form of a man, who, when arraigned on trial for a forgery, should plead that he did it, *solely by accident*, not by design? Would not such a paltry excuse justly be esteemed an aggravation to the offence? and yet a man so circumstanced, might with as much truth, set up such a pretence, as do the compilers for the alterations, which they have wittingly made.

It is cause of deep regret to us, that persons professing themselves members of a religious society, once honourably distinguished by its conscientious regard to truth and integrity, should have given occasion for the remarks which we have been obliged to make; and especially when under the pretence of advocating *religious principles*. Great indeed must be their defection from the sincerity of our worthy predecessors! We know not who the compilers are, and consequently cannot be actuated by personal feelings, in aught we have said. The task of exposing their errors has been by no means a pleasant one; but when we remembered how prompt and decided the early Quakers were, in replying to every accusation alleged against them, and how zealously they vindicated their infant society from the charges which are now revived by the compilers; justice to the memory of these worthy christians, love to the Society of Friends, as well as a sense of duty, impelled us to engage in the present work. We have endeavoured to state the truth honestly, though plainly, and trust that in so doing, we have been actuated only by upright motives.

The following accusations being substantially the same as those insinuated in the pamphlet; and the replies to them, asserting the true belief of the primitive Friends, may properly claim a place in this conclusion, viz:

“It hath been an objection often made, sometimes foolishly, sometimes enviously, but *always falsely*; that we deny the holy Three, mentioned 1 John v. 7, which bear record in heaven: because we cannot but think the word “Person,” too gross to express them. *We own their distinction in all the instances of it, recorded in Holy writ*; and have a thousand times *declared our sincere belief*, in Almighty God, the creator of all things; and in Jesus Christ his eternal Son, by whom all things were made, and in the Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Father and the Son.”—Switch for the Snake, p. 184.

“Snake, p. 121.—The Quakers and Socinians, acknowledge a Three, but deny a trinity, which is to confess the same thing in English and to deny it in Latin: for trinitas is only Latin for three—But the meaning is, they would not have the Three in heaven to be Three persons. Though they cannot make sense of Three what they are, if not Three Persons.” To which Joseph Wveth replies:

"What the Socinians acknowledge is not my business to enquire. But for ourselves, *We acknowledge the Three mentioned in Holy Writ*, which bear record in heaven, and we need not the pendency of the Snake, to translate the word into Latin: and the sense we make of the Three, so bearing record, is the same which is declared by the Holy Ghost; and when the Snake shall show that the Holy Ghost hath declared them, Three Persons, we will not fail so to express them."—Pages 186, 187.

"According to what has been already spoken in the foregoing sections, occasionally, concerning the Divinity and incarnation of Christ, I do here of set purpose declare it as a truth, which now is, and always hath been, since we were a people, believed and declared by us: That the Word which was in the beginning with God, by which all things were made; did in the fulness of time, according to the appointment of the Father, take flesh, and was born of the Virgin Mary, and that in that body of flesh, the fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily. Thus in the largeness of the expression, and sense of Scripture, we do truly and sincerely own, according to John i. 14. that the Word was made flesh, &c. dwelt on the earth, and took on him, not the nature of angels; not any aerial or fantastical body; but the seed of Abraham and David; and this he did for the same reason and behoof mentioned by the apostle, Heb. ii. 17, 18. Wherefore in all things it behoveth him to be made like unto his brethren that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted. For which infinite love of Jesus Christ, in being both the Saviour and Reconciler of men to God, through himself, we sincerely say with the apostle, Heb. iii. 3, For this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath more honour than the house.

"Reader, these, and all other testimonies recorded in Holy Writ, testifying to the manhood as well as the divinity of Jesus Christ, we do, and always did sincerely own: so that should our books, in which is treated directly on this subject, and abundantly more largely, and particularly than here it can be, be collected, they would make many volumes. Yet such hath been, and is the inveterate malice of our enemies, that our writings no more than our words, must not mean what we so often and solemnly have declared we do mean by them; but what our adversaries will have them to mean, that so they may not seem to want proofs for these their false and envious charges. What now remains for us to do? But still to persevere in our true and scriptural belief; and to repeat our testimonies of it to the envious objections of enemies; and for the satisfaction of the sober enquirer."—p. 191, 192.

"In the section immediately foregoing, the divinity and incarnation of Christ, is largely treated of, and I have therein shown that we own and believe both, as declared fully and truly in the Holy Scriptures, and also that our books, rescued from the perversions of this our adversary, do speak according to that acknowledged rule.

It remains, that in this, I now show that *we have always owned in like scriptural sense; that Jesus Christ, in life, doctrine, and death, did fulfil his Father's will, and did offer up himself, a most satisfactory sacrifice for the sins of mankind; in opposition to the false insinuations of the Snake herein, who says, p. 151. Herein the Quakers are direct Socinians, for they positively deny the satisfaction.*

“Under which cloudy charge, he insinuates *as if we did deny what the scriptures do declare herein: which is false*, and he might with equal sincerity have said, the Church of England do deny the satisfaction. For to come nearer, the satisfaction which is positively denied by us, is as positively denied by the Church of England, which is, *that rigid and strict notion of satisfaction*, which some had doctrinally, but unscripturally laid down, in the terms following, viz: —[Here the author inserts William Penn's description of the doctrine, for which see page 38 of this work.]

“This, reader, is the satisfaction, or strict and rigid notion of it which we do deny, and which William Penn as quoted by the Snake, p. 154, does totally exclude, as anon I shall have occasion more largely to show. But that we do from hence deny the satisfaction *which Christ did make, and which the Father did accept, as mentioned and declared in Holy Writ, is very false*. For we do believe that as our Saviour does declare, John x. 18, ‘No man taketh it from me, (speaking of his life,) but I lay it down of myself: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment received I of my Father.’ I say, *we do believe that as Christ had this commandment and power from the Father, so by his pure, divine, free and voluntary resignation, ‘not as I will, but as thou wilt,’ Matt. xxvi. 42, he did, thereby endear the Father's love unto him, as himself declares, verse 17, Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life. And this his free, and unconstrained, voluntary offering of himself as a ransom for all, did include his agony on the mount, and his agony on the cross; in fine, it includes all his sufferings, both inward and outward, whereby he became a complete, perfect, and satisfactory sacrifice, and as such was accepted of the Father. This briefly, but truly, and according to scripture, is a short account of the satisfaction which we do positively own; as the former is an account of the satisfaction which we do positively deny*”—Pages 230, 231, 232.

“The Quakers dispute against these, (viz: the outward sufferings and death of Christ,) and place the merit and satisfaction, *in the allegorical sufferings and blood of their light within, inwardly shed, &c.*

“This assertion of the Snake, is not *allegorically, but literally a lie; for we acknowledge the satisfaction made by Christ to his Father, but we do deny that groundless and dangerous notion, of his having paid, and his Father exacted, that strict and rigorous satisfaction, by undergoing the self-same punishment and pains that the damned suffer in hell.*

“*We own the merit of his outward death and sufferings, but dispute, against the misapplication of that merit, to ungodly men, continuing impenitently in their sins.*

“We own and believe, that men by continuing impenitently in

their sins, do press, as with sheaves, the Holy Spirit, and by such, their despite to the Spirit of grace, do grieve the good Spirit of God, which he hath shed abroad upon the hearts of men in order to their regeneration. *But have never said or believed, that the satisfaction made by Christ to the Father, and the merit thereof, consisted in any allegorical suffering and blood of the Light within, inwardly shed.*

“We own and believe, that men through obedience to the spirit of grace, may come to have their consciences sprinkled from dead works, to serve the living God; and may through the blood of the everlasting covenant, be made perfect in every good work to do the will of God, through Jesus Christ. *But have never placed, or believed the possibility thereof, did consist in such allegorical death and sufferings, as the Snake does insinuate against us; no more than the apostle, in these and other places of Holy Writ, where he directs men to the Word, Christ, in them, can be supposed to undervalue the outward death, and sufferings of Christ, at Jerusalem, and to place the satisfaction he made to the Father, and the merit of it, to consist in these his spiritual appearances, by the Holy Spirit, in the hearts of men.*”—Switch, pages 7, 8.

“*We have always testified according to 2 Tim. iii. 16. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. And the reason of this is, because according to 2 Pet. i. 21. The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. And therefore, it is, that we have constantly directed men, to the Holy Spirit for the true understanding of them; by the movings whereof they were at first written. For as they do contain a true declaration of the things of God, so they are not to be truly understood, but by the Spirit of God. How much the contrary of this can be proved by this Snake, I shall now examine.*

“Snake, page 85.—The Quakers’ notion of the Light within, (as before explained,) must necessarily cut off our dependence upon the Holy Scriptures, as a rule either of faith or manners.

“*The Light within, Christ in us, as before I have explained, as it is not contrary to the scriptures; so it does not cut them off from being useful, as before declared; viz: for doctrine, reproof, correction, &c. For though the Holy Spirit is as infallible now as ever, and it is the same Holy Spirit, (manifested in the hearts of men at this day,) by which the holy men did write the scriptures, yet the manifestations thereof to them, being in greater degree, we justly give them the priority; this, with respect to the writings of any faithful servant of Christ at this day. But with respect to the Holy Spirit, that being, (as I have just now said,) as infallible now as ever; it must of necessity also follow, that whosoever, through obedience, follows the guidings of it, must have as sure, (because the same,) rule as the prophets and apostles had. And this is no more contradictory, than the parable of the talents, Matt. xxv., in which our Saviour shows the different proportions of trust of the same treasure: and the one talent, had it been employed in the same way, which the five were, it would as certainly have gained profit. Thus they who*

through obedience, improve their talent, and are in the apostle's phrase, 2 Cor. vi. 1, workers together with Christ, they shall witness a growth in his grace; and who do so grow, have the same sure rule of the Holy Spirit, to read and understand the scriptures by, even the same sure rule, which the prophets and apostles had, when they writ them. Hence it is, that he that hath, and obeys the least measure of this sure rule, the Holy Spirit in himself, will easily and readily acknowledge and consent, to the further degrees of the revealed will of the Holy Spirit, recorded in the scriptures of truth."—pages 150, 151.

Such are the doctrines and principles which the Society of Friends has ever maintained, and which all those who are consistent members of it, do still maintain, notwithstanding the many contrary assertions which invidious opposers, or pretended friends have been pleased to make in their name. And however its christian reputation may be eclipsed by the sorrowful defection of some nominal members, from that holy faith which in so remarkable a manner was committed to our worthy predecessors, the profession grievous suffering, we reverently rejoice in the unshaken belief that our christian doctrines will never fall to the ground—but that He who raised us up to be a people, and so signally blessed us with the Holy Spirit, will still continue to preserve faithful witnesses unto himself, who amid all the storms of calumny, and the reproaches of that spirit which still delights to be the accuser of the brethren, will stand nobly and firmly for the support of the glorious gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

To conclude, we sincerely adopt the following expressions of the great and dignified Penn, in his address to the Bishop of Cork :

“That God, that has upheld us by his free spirit to this day, through many and great afflictions, we firmly believe, will suffer nothing to attend us, that shall not in the conclusion work for his glory and our good, if we continue stedfast to the end, in the blessed way of righteousness, wherein he has so often and signally owned and preserved us; notwithstanding the violence of open enemies, and the treacherous and restless endeavours of *false FRIENDS*.”—Vol. ii. page 915.

PART SECOND.

SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF

FOX, PENN, BARCLAY, PENNINGTON, WHITEHEAD, CLARIDGE,
CROOK, BURROUGH,

AND OTHER DISTINGUISHED MEMBERS

OF THE

SOCIETY OF FRIENDS,

SHOWING THE CONSISTENCY OF THEIR FAITH AND DOCTRINES WITH
THE DIVINE TESTIMONY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

Note.—The following selections, from the writings of many ancient, and honourable members of the Society of Friends, will fully establish the assertion, that since its first rise, the same doctrines have ever been held and promulgated by all those who were in unity with the body; and that, whatever calumnies might be raised against them, whether by open enemies, pretended friends, or apostatized members, the true Quakers have ever been sincere believers, in all the doctrines of the Christian religion, as they are set forth in the Holy Scriptures.

The limits of the present volume will admit of inserting but a small part of the abundant testimony, which goes to prove this point, in the most conclusive manner. So frequently and fully did our predecessors assert the soundness of their belief, in the Three that bear witness in heaven; the divinity, atonement, mediation, and intercession of our blessed Lord; and the inestimable value of the Holy Scriptures, that if these declarations were all collected, they would, alone, fill a large volume.

GEORGE FOX.

On page 86 of George Fox's Journal, we find the following :

" This priest Stevens a-ked me, ' Why Christ cried out upon the cross, " My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me ? "' and why he said, ' If it be possible, let this cup pass from me, yet not my will but thine be done ? ' I told him, at that time *the sins of all mankind were upon him*, and their iniquities and transgressions, *with which he was wounded ; which he was to bear, and to be an offering for*, as he was man, but died not as he was God ; so in that he died for all men, *tasting death for every man, he was an offering for the sins of the whole world*. This I spoke, being at that time, in a measure, sensible of Christ's sufferings."—1644.

" Though I had great openings, yet great trouble and temptations came many times upon me, so that when it was day I wished for night, and when it was night, I wished for day ; and by reason of the openings I had in my troubles, I could say as David said, ' Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge.' When I had openings, they *answered one another*, and *answered the scriptures*, for I had great openings of the scriptures, and when I was in troubles, one trouble also answered to another."—Page 90. 1646.

" The ranters pleaded that God made the devil : I denied it ; and told them I was come into the power of God, the Seed, Christ, which was before the devil was, and bruised his head ; and he became a devil by going out of truth ; and so became a murderer and a destroyer. I showed them that God did not make him a devil ; for God is a God of truth, and made all things good, and blessed them ; but God did not bless the devil. And the devil is bad, and was a liar and a murderer from the beginning, and spoke of himself, and not from God." Page 278. 1655.

" I turned the people to the divine light, which Christ, the heavenly and spiritual Man, enlighteneth them withal, that with that light they might see their sins, and that they were in death and darkness, and without God in the world, and might also see Christ, from whom it cometh, their Saviour and Redeemer, who shed his blood and died for them, who is the way to God, the truth, and the life."—Page 299. 1655.

In a general epistle to the yearly meeting of Friends, in London, he says—

" As the gospel is preached again, if your faith doth not stand in the power, but in men, and in the wisdom of words, you will grow carnal ; and such are for judgment, who cry up Paul or Apollos

AND NOT CHRIST, *the author of your faith.* *Those that love to be popular, would have people's faith stand in them, such do not preach Christ, but themselves.* But such as preach Christ and his gospel, would have every man and woman to be in the possession of it, and every man's and woman's faith to stand in Christ, the author of it, and in the power of God; in which, as their faith stands, nothing can get betwixt them and God; for if any should fall amongst us, as *too many have done*, that leads its followers either into the waters, or into the earth."—Vol. ii. page 213. 1676.

In a paper which he wrote, "concerning the true church," &c. he says—

"Christ took upon him the seed of Abraham; he doth not say the corrupt seed of the gentiles; so, according to the flesh, he was of the holy seed of Abraham and David, and his *holy body and blood was an offering and a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world*, as a Lamb without blemish, whose flesh saw no corruption. By *the one offering of himself*, in the new testament, or new covenant, he has put an end to all the offerings and sacrifices, amongst the Jews in the old testament. Christ, the holy Seed, was crucified, dead, and buried, according to the flesh, and raised again the third day, and his flesh saw no corruption. Though he was crucified in the flesh, yet quickened again by the spirit, and is alive, and liveth forevermore, and hath all power in heaven and earth given to him, and reigneth over all, and is *the one Mediator between God and man, even the man Christ Jesus.* Christ said, 'he gave his flesh for the life of the world;' and the apostle saith, 'his flesh saw no corruption;' so that which saw no corruption, he gave for the life of the corrupt world, to bring them out of corruption. Christ said again, 'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. And he that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.' He that eats not his flesh, and drinks not his blood, which is the life of the flesh, hath not eternal life. As the apostle saith, 'All died in Adam;' then all are dead. Now all coming spiritually to eat the flesh of Christ, the second Adam, and drink his blood, his blood and flesh, give all the dead in Adam, life, and quicken them out of their sins and trespasses, in which they were dead; so they come to sit together in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus, and are living members of the church of Christ that he is the Head of, and are clothed with the Sun of righteousness, the Son of God, that never changes, and have the changeable moon under their feet, and all changeable worldly things, inventions, and works of men's hands."—Vol. ii. pages 384, 385. 1686.

In an essay entitled the "Royal Law of God Revived," &c. he says,

"And further saith the apostle in 1st John i. 1, 2. '*We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world.*'"

"Now mark, this is a large word for all people to take notice of. *That Jesus Christ is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world*

Therefore every one of you, in your own particulars, know this, that *Christ Jesus who is crowned with glory and honour, did taste death for every man ; mark, for every man :* AND WHOSOEVER DENIES THIS DOCTRINE IS AN ANTICHRIST, AND PREACHES ANOTHER, IS A FALSE PREACHER AND SEDUCER, *and brings people to trouble and loss, from that which is right, and their due, in which is their satisfaction :* so these are universal things to all mankind, whereby all mankind might come out of the earthly old Adam, in the fall and transgression, to *him that hath died for them all, and purchased them all, and tasted death for all, and enlightened them all, and gave his grace to them all ; and he willeth that all might be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth of Christ, who doth this : And whoever teacheth another doctrine, brings people into sects and confusion, to destroy one another, where they have not natural affections, and will do that to another, which they would not have others do unto them, who break the bonds thereby of civil commerce amongst mankind, and the religions, ways and worships of all such, are no worships, religions, nor ways to God, but set up by a dark, peevish, spirit, by which they destroy one another, which are God's creatures, about them ; all which come from him, who is out of the truth, whom Christ came to destroy.*"—Page 19. 1671.

In his "answer to all such as falsely say, the Quakers are no Christians," written from Worcester Prison, and printed in the year 1682, he has the following declaration, viz :

" And Christ hath purchased his Church with his own blood, Acts xx. 28. ' And we give thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light, who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son, *in whom we have redemption through his blood, that is, the forgiveness of sins, who is the image of the invisible God, the first begotten of every creature ; for by him were all things created, which are in Heaven, and which are in earth, things visible, and invisible, whether they be thrones, dominions, principalities, or powers, all things were created by him and for him ; and he is before all things ; and in him, and by him, all things consists ; and he is the Head of the body, (the Church) who is the beginning, and the first begotten from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence ; for it pleased the Father, that in him should all fulness dwell, Col. i.*' And many other scriptures we might bring, which do prove that Christ is the Head of the Church.

" And Christ saith, all power in Heaven and in earth is given to me, Matt. xxviii. 18. And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ ; this is the true God, and eternal life, 1st John v. 20. And Christ and the Apostles in their days, did not set up one man to be Pope (nor set a triple crown on his head) to be Christ's vicar and vicerent upon earth, nor set him above the Apostles, &c. : but on the contrary, Christ said, it was the Gentiles that exercised lordship, and are called gracious lords ; but said Christ, he that will be the

greatest among you, let him be servant unto all: not Pope or Lord over all, but servant unto all. And Christ gave the keys and power to others of his disciples, as well as Peter, to bind and loose, Matt. xviii. 19. And so Christ prayed for all his disciples and followers, that God had given him, that he would keep them from the evil of the world; and not only for Peter, as may be seen in John xvii. 9. And we own the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as the Apostles have declared.

“When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the law, that he might redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons, Gal. iv. 4, 5. And by the grace of God, *Christ tasted death for every man*, Heb. ii. 9. And how that *Christ died for our sins*, according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and rose again, according to the scriptures, 1st Cor. xv. 3, 4. *For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, Jesus Christ*, 1st Cor. iii. 11. And so we believe those things which God before hath showed, by the mouth of all his prophets, that *Christ should suffer*, and he hath thus fulfilled it, and is risen from the dead, and is at the right hand of God, who is alive again, and lives for evermore; and will reward every man according to his deeds, and is the Judge both of the quick and dead, and his sheep now hear his voice, and follow him, as in the Apostles’ days, Acts iii. Rev. i. 18. Neither is there salvation in any other than in the name of Jesus; for there is none other name given under Heaven among men, whereby we must be saved, Acts iv. 12. And without controversy, great is the Mystery of Godliness, God manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, and received up into glory, 1 Tim. iii. 16. And it is the spirit that beareth witness, because the spirit is truth; for there are Three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are one; and there are Three which bear record in earth, &c. *which we own*, 1st John v. 6, 7. And now let none be offended, because we do not call them by those unscriptural names of Trinity, and Three Persons, which are not scripture words; and so do falsely say, that we deny the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, which Three are one that bear record in Heaven, &c. *which Three we own with all our hearts, as the apostle John did, and as all true Christians ever did, and now do*, and if you say, we are not Christians, because we do not call the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the trinity, distinct and separate persons: then you may as well conclude that John was no Christian, who did not give the Father, Word, and Holy Ghost, these names.

“We believe concerning God the Father, Son, and Spirit, according to the testimony of the Holy Scripture, which we receive and embrace as the most authentic and perfect declaration of Christian faith, being indited by the Holy Spirit of God, that never errs: 1st, That there is one God and Father, of whom are all things; 2ndly, That there is one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom all things were made, John i. and xvii. Rom. ix. who was glorified with the Father before the world began, who is God over all, blessed forever, John

xiv. That there is one Holy Spirit, the promise of the Father and the Son, and leader, and sanctifier, and comforter of his people, 1st John v. And we further believe, *as the Holy Scriptures soundly and sufficiently express*, that these Three are one, even the Father, the Word, and Spirit.

“ And in the fulness of time according to the promise of the Father, Christ was manifested in the flesh, and by the grace of God *tasted death for every man*, as before, is risen, and ascended, and sits on the right hand of God in Heaven, and is *the only Mediator* between God and man; and that he exercises his prophetic, kingly, and priestly office, now in his church, and also his offices, as a Counsellor and Leader, Bishop, Shepherd and Mediator, he (to wit) the Son of God, he exercises these offices, in his household of faith, whose house we are, that are believers in the light, and by faith engrafted into Christ, the Word, by whom all things were made; and so are heirs of eternal life, being elected in him before the world began. And we do not matter if this Jewish spirit saith now of us, as it did formerly of the followers of Christ, that none but accursed people followed him, that knew not the law; and if you say as Nathaniel said, John i. 46, can there any good thing come out of Nazareth? We say with Philip, come and see.”—Pages 26, 27, 28.

ROBERT BARCLAY.

“Question.—What are they that bear record in heaven ?

“Answer.—There are Three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are One.”—Catechism, page 2.

After reciting the texts which prove the pre-existence of our blessed Lord, he thus queries—

“Question.—These are very clear, that even the world was created by Christ: But what scriptures prove the divinity of Christ against such as *falsely deny the same* ?

“Answer.—And the Word was God. Whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all God blessed forever. Amen. Who being in the form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God. And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ: this is the true God and eternal life.”—Page 8.

“Question.—After what manner doth the scripture assert the conjunction and unity of the eternal Son of God, in and with the Man Christ Jesus ?

“Answer.—And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth. For he whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him. How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. In him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.”—Page 11.

“For the infinite, and most wise God who is the foundation, root, and spring of all operation, hath wrought all things by his eternal Word and Son. This is that Word that was in the beginning with God, and was God, by whom all things were made, and without whom was not any thing made that was made. This is that Jesus Christ, by whom God created all things, by whom and for whom all things were created that are in heaven, and in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, Coloss. i. 16. Who therefore is called the First-Born of every creature, Coloss. i. 15. As then that infinite and incomprehensible fountain of life and motion operateth in the creatures by his own eternal word and power, so no creature has access again unto him but in and by the Son, according to his own express words, ‘No man

knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him,' Matt. xi. 27, Luke x. 22. And again he himself saith, 'I am the way, the truth, and the life: No man cometh unto the Father, but by me,' John xiv. 6.

"Hence he is fitly called the Mediator betwixt God and man: for having been with God from all eternity, being himself God, and also in time, partaking of the nature of man, through him, is the goodness and love of God conveyed to mankind, and by him again, man receiveth and partaketh of these mercies."—Apology, page 27.

After speaking at large of the Holy Spirit of Christ, wherewith all men are enlightened for their salvation and redemption, he adds—

"But by this as we do not at all intend to equal ourselves to that Holy Man, the Lord Jesus Christ, who was born of the Virgin Mary, in whom all the fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily; so neither do we destroy the reality of his present existence, as some have falsely calumniated us. For though we affirm that Christ dwells in us, yet not immediately, but mediately, as he is in that seed which is in us; whereas he, to wit, the Eternal Word, which was with God, and was God, dwelt immediately in that holy Man. He then is as the head, and we as the members, he the vine, and we the branches. Now as the soul of man dwells otherwise, and in a far more immediate manner in the head and in the heart, than in the hands or legs; and as the sap, virtue and life of the vine, lodgeth far otherwise in the stock and root, than in the branches, so God dwelleth otherwise in the man Jesus, than in us. We also freely reject the heresy of Appollinarius, who denied him to have any soul, but said the body was only actuated by the Godhead. As also the error of Eutyches, who made the manhood to be wholly swallowed up of the Godhead. Wherefore, as we believe he was a true and real man, so we also believe that he continues so to be glorified in the heavens, in soul and body, by whom God shall judge the world, in the great and general day of judgment."—Apology, page 139.

"First then, as by the explanation of the former thesis appears, we renounce all natural power and ability in ourselves, in order to bring us out of our lost and fallen condition, and first nature; and confess, that as of ourselves we are able to do nothing that is good, so neither can we procure remission of sins or justification by any act of our own, so as to merit it, or draw it as a debt from God due unto us, but we acknowledge all to be of and from his love, which is the original and fundamental cause of our acceptance.

"Secondly: God manifested this love towards us, in the sending of his beloved Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, into the world; who gave himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet smelling savour; and having made peace through the blood of his cross, that he might reconcile us unto himself, and by the Eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot unto God, and suffered for our sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us unto God.

"Thirdly then, Forasmuch as all men who have come to man's estate, (the man Jesus only excepted,) have sinned, therefore all have need of this Saviour, to remove the wrath of God from them, due to their offences: in this respect he is truly said to have borne the ini-

quities of us all, in his body on the tree, and therefore is the only Mediator, having qualified the wrath of God towards us; so that our former sins stand not in our way, being, *by virtue of his most satisfactory sacrifice*, removed and pardoned. Neither do we think that remission of sins is to be expected, sought, or obtained, any other way, or by any works or sacrifice whatsoever, though as has been said formerly, they may come to partake of this remission, that are ignorant of the history. So then, Christ, by his death and sufferings hath reconciled us to God, even while we are enemies; that is, he offers reconciliation unto us; we are put into a capacity of being reconciled; God is willing to forgive us our iniquities, and to accept us, as is well expressed by the apostle, 2 Cor. v. 19, God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath put in us the word of reconciliation. And therefore the apostle, in the next verses, entreats them in Christ's stead to be reconciled to God; intimating that the wrath of God being removed by the obedience of Christ Jesus, he is willing to be reconciled unto them, and ready to remit the sins that are past, if they repent.

“ We consider then, our redemption in a twofold respect or state. both which in their own nature, are perfect, though in their application to us, the one is not, nor can not be, without respect to the other.

“ The first, is the redemption performed and accomplished by Christ for us, *in his crucified body, without us*: the other is the redemption wrought by Christ in us; which no less properly is called and accounted a redemption than the former. The first then, is that, whereby a man, as he stands in the fall, is put into a capacity of salvation, and hath conveyed unto him, a measure of that power, virtue, spirit, life, and grace, that was in Christ Jesus, which as the free gift of God, is able to counterbalance, overcome and root out the evil seed, wherewith we are naturally, as in the fall, leavened.

“ The second is that, whereby we witness and know this pure and perfect redemption in ourselves, purifying, cleansing, and redeeming us, from the power of corruption, and bringing us into unity, favour and friendship with God. By the first of these two, we that were lost in Adam, plunged into the bitter and corrupt seed, unable of ourselves to do any good thing, but naturally joined and united to evil, forward and propense to all iniquity, servants and slaves to the power and spirit of darkness, *are notwithstanding all this, so far reconciled to God, by the death of his Son, while enemies, that we are put into a capacity of salvation*, having the glad tidings of the gospel of peace offered unto us, and God is reconciled unto us, in Christ, calls and invites us to himself, in which respect we understand these scriptures, ‘ He slew the enmity in himself. He loved us first; seeing us in our blood, he said unto us, live; He who did not sin, his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree: and he died for our sins, the just for the unjust.’ ”—p. 202, and seq.

“ In this respect above mentioned then, we have shown what service and use the Holy Scriptures, as managed, in and by the spirit, are of to the Church of God; wherefore we do account them a secondary rule. Moreover because they are commonly acknowledg-

ed by all, to have been written by the dictates of the Holy Spirit, and that the errors, which may be supposed by the injury of times to have slipped in, are not such but that there is, a sufficient clear testimony left to all the essentials of the christian faith ; we do look upon them as the only fit outward judge of controversies among christians ; and that whatsoever doctrine is contrary unto their testimony, may therefore justly be rejected as false. And for our parts we are very willing that all our doctrines and practices be tried by them ; which we never refused, nor ever shall, in all controversies with our adversaries, as the judge and test. We shall also, be very willing to admit it as a positive, certain maxim, that whatsoever any do, pretending the spirit which is contrary to the scriptures, be accounted, and reckoned a delusion of the devil. For as we never lay claim to the Spirit's leadings, that we may cover ourselves in any thing that is evil, so we know that as every evil, contradicts the scriptures, so it doth also the Spirit, in the first place, from which the scriptures came, and whose motions can never contradict one another, though they may appear sometimes to be contradictory to the blind eye of the natural man, as Paul and James seem to contradict one another."—Pages 85, 86.

WILLIAM PENN,

IN his Testimony to the Truth as held by the people called Quakers, written in 1698, has these declarations :

“Concerning the Father, the Word, and the Spirit. Because we have been very cautious in expressing our faith concerning that great mystery, especially in such school terms, and philosophical distinctions as are unscriptural, if not unsound, (the tendency whereof hath been to raise frivolous controversies and animosities amongst men,) we have, by those that desire to lessen our christian reputation, been represented as deniers of the Trinity at large: Whereas we ever believed, and as constantly maintained, the truth of that blessed Holy Scripture, *Three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and that these Three are One; the which we both sincerely and reverently believe according to 1 John v. 7.* And this is sufficient for us to believe, and know, and hath a tendency to edification and holiness; when the contrary centres only in imaginations, and strife, and persecution, where it runs high and to parties, as may be read in bloody characters in the ecclesiastical histories.”—Vol. ii. page 879.

“Of Christ’s coming, both in flesh and spirit. Because the tendency, (generally speaking,) of our ministry, is to press people to the inward and spiritual appearance of Christ, by his spirit and grace in their hearts, to give them a true sight and sense of, and sorrow for sin, to amendment of life, and practice of holiness: and because we have often opposed that doctrine, of being actually justified by the merits of Christ, whilst actual sinners against God, by living in the pollutions of this wicked world: We are by our adversaries rendered such, as either deny or undervalue the coming of Christ without us, and the force and efficacy of his death and sufferings, as a propitiation for the sins of the whole world. *Whereas we do, and hope we ever shall, as we always did, confess the glory of God the Father, and the honour of his dear and beloved Son, that he, to wit, Jesus Christ, took our nature upon him, was like us in all things, sin excepted: that he was born of the Virgin Mary, went about amongst men doing good, and working many miracles: that he was betrayed by Judas into the hands of the chief priests, &c., that he suffered death under Pontius Pilate, the Roman Governor, being crucified between two thieves, and was buried in the sepulchre of Joseph of Arimathea: rose again the third day from the dead, and ascended into Heaven, and sits at God’s right hand, in the power and majesty of his Father, and that by him, God the Father, will one day judge the whole world, both of quick and dead, according to their works.*”—pages 880, 881.

“Of Christ’s being our example. Because in some cases we have

said the Lord Jesus, was our great example, and that *his* obedience to *his* Father, doth not excuse *ours*, but as by keeping his commandments, he abode in his Father's love, so must we follow his example of obedience, so abide in his love; some have been so ignorant, (or that which is worse,) as to venture to say for us, or in our name, that we believe our Lord Jesus Christ, was in all things but an example. Whereas we confess him to be so much more than an example, that we believe him to be, our most acceptable sacrifice to God his Father, who, for his sake, will look upon fallen man, that hath justly merited the wrath of God, upon his return by repentance, faith, and obedience, as if he had never sinned at all; 1 John ii. 12. Rom. iii. 26. x. 9, 10. Heb. v. 9."—page 830.

In his "Primitive Christianity Revived," we find the following:

"We do believe, that Jesus Christ was our holy sacrifice, atonement and propitiation; that he bore our iniquities, and that by his stripes we were healed of the wounds Adam gave us in his fall; and that God is just in forgiving true penitents upon the credit of that holy offering, Christ made of himself to God for us, and that what he did and suffered, satisfied and pleased God, and was for the sake of fallen man, that had displeased God: And that through the offering up of himself once for all, through the Eternal Spirit, he hath forever perfected those, (IN ALL TIMES,) that were sanctified, who walked not after the flesh, but after the Spirit, Rom. viii. 1. Mark that.

"In short, justification consists of two parts, or hath a twofold consideration, viz: Justification from the guilt of sin, and justification from the power and pollution of sin, and in this sense justification gives a man a full and clear acceptance before God. For want of this latter part it is, that so many souls, religiously inclined, are often under doubts, scruples, and despondencies, notwithstanding all that their teachers tell them of the extent and efficacy of the first part of justification. And it is too general an unhappiness among the professors of christianity that they are apt to cloak their own active and passive disobedience, with the active and passive obedience of Christ. The first part of justification, *we do reverently and humbly acknowledge, is only for the sake of the death and sufferings of Christ: nothing we can do, though by the operation of the Holy Spirit, being able to cancel old debts, or wipe out old scores: it is the power and efficacy of that propitiatory offering, upon faith and repentance, that justifies us, from the sins that are past; and it is the power of Christ's spirit in our hearts, that purifies and makes us acceptable before God. For 'till the heart of man is purged from sin, God will never accept of it. He reproveth, rebuketh, and condemns those that entertain sin there, and therefore, such cannot be said to be in a justified state, condemnation and justification being contraries: so that they that hold themselves in a justified state by the active and passive obedience of Christ, while they are not actively and passively obedient to the spirit of Christ Jesus, are under a strong and dangerous delusion; and for crying out against this, sin-pleasing imagination, 'not to say doctrine we are stoned and reproached as deniers and despisers of the death and sufferings of our Lord Jesus Christ. But be it known to such, they add to Christ's*

sufferings and crucify to themselves afresh the Son of God, and trample the blood of the covenant under their feet, that walk unholily, under a profession of justification; for God will not acquit the guilty, nor justify the disobedient and unfaithful. Such deceive themselves, and at the great and final judgment their sentence will not be, "come ye blessed;" because it cannot be said to them, "Well done good and faithful," for they cannot be so esteemed, that live and die in a reproveable and condemnable state; but "Go ye cursed, &c."—pages 867, 868. 1696.

In his "Christiau Quaker," published in 1673, he says—

"Further Christ himself says, "I am the light of the world," which is as much as if he had said, "I have lighted, or shined forth to the world;" therefore the light which shines in the hearts of mankind, is Christ, though we do not say that every particular illumination is the entire Christ, for so there would be as many Christs as men, which *were absurd* and blasphemous."—Vol. i. p. 569.

In his "Key, &c." printed 1692, we find the following—

"Perversion 2nd. The Quakers hold, that the light within them is God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit, so that every Quaker has whole God, Christ, and holy Spirit in him, which is gross blasphemy.

"Principle. This is also a mistake of their belief: *They never said that every divine illumination, or manifestation of Christ, in the hearts of men, was whole God, Christ, or the Spirit,* which might render them guilty of that gross and blasphemous absurdity, some would fasten upon them: But that God who is light, or the Word Christ, who is light, styled the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, and the Quickening Spirit, who is God over all, blessed forever, hath enlightened mankind, *with a measure of saving light; Who said, I am the light of the world, and they that follow me, shall not abide in darkness, but have the Light of Life.* So that the illumination is from God, or Christ the Divine Word; *but not therefore that whole God or Christ is in every man, any more than the whole sun or air, is in every house or chamber. There are no such harsh and unscriptural words in their writings. It is only a frightful perversion of some of their enemies, to bring an odium upon their holy faith.* Yet *in a sense,* the scriptures say it, and that is their sense in which *only* they say the same thing. I will walk in them and dwell in them. He that dwelleth with you shall be in you. I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you: I in them and they in me; Christ in us the hope of glory. Unless Christ be in you, ye are reprobates. Little children of whom I travail again in birth, until Christ be formed in you. Now if they who denied his coming in the flesh, though high professing Jews, were to be accounted anti-christs, because enemies to that appearance and dispensation of God to men: what must they be reputed, who as stiffly disown his inward, nearer, and more spiritual coming, formation, and dominion in the soul, which is to be sure, the higher and nobler knowledge of Christ? Yea, the mystery hid from ages, and now revealed to God's people: the riches of the glory of the mystery, which God reserved to be made known to the Gentiles, of whose stock we are. Certainly

though they are called christians they must be no whit less anti-christs than those obstinate Jews of old that opposed his more visible and bodily appearance." Vol. ii. p. 780.

In his "Testimony to the Truth, &c." he thus speaks of the belief of Friends in the Scriptures—

"Concerning the Holy Scriptures. Because we assert the Holy Spirit to be the first, great, and general rule and guide of true christians, as *that*, by which God is worshipped, sin detected, conscience convicted, duty manifested, scripture unfolded and explained, and consequently the rule for understanding the Scriptures themselves, (since by it, they were at first given forth;) from hence our adversaries are pleased to make us blasphemers of the Holy Scriptures, undervaluing their authority, preferring our own books before them, with more to that purpose: *Whereas we in truth and sincerity believe them to be of divine authority, given by the inspiration of God, through holy men, they speaking or writing them, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost: that they are a declaration of those things most surely believed by the primitive christians, and that as they contain the mind and will of God, and are his commands to us; so they in that respect are his declaratory word; and therefore are obligatory on us, and are profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness, that the man of God, may be perfect, and thoroughly furnished to every good work.*

"Nay, after all, so unjust is the charge, and so remote from our belief, concerning the Holy Scriptures, that we both love, honour, and prefer them, before all books in the world; ever choosing to express our belief of the christian faith and doctrine, in the terms thereof, and rejecting all principles or doctrines whatsoever, that are repugnant thereunto.

"Nevertheless we are well persuaded, that notwithstanding there is such an excellency in the Holy Scriptures, as we have above declared, yet the unstable, and unlearned in Christ's school, too often wrest them to their own destruction. And upon our reflection on their carnal constructions of them, we are made undervaluers of Scripture itself. But certain it is, that as the Lord hath been pleased to give us, the experience of the fulfilling of them in measure, so *it is altogether contrary to our faith and practice to put any manner of slight or contempt upon them, much more, of being guilty of what maliciously is suggested against us; since no society of professed christians in the world, can have a more reverent and honourable esteem for them than we have; John iv. 24. xvi. 8. Rom. i. 19. Luke i. 1. 2. Tim. iii. 16. 17. 2 Pet. iii. 16*"—Vol. ii. p. 878.

GEORGE WHITEHEAD.

George Whitehead being questioned by a priest as to his belief in the Trinity, gives this reply :

“ I answered him in terms of Holy Scriptures, viz : that I really own and believe the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are the Three which bear record in Heaven; the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these Three are One, according to the doctrine of John the Evangelist, 1st John v. 7.”—Works, page 168. 1659.

“ The Holy Scripture Trinity, or Three thereby meant, we never questioned, but believed; as also the unity of Essence; that they are one substance, one Divine infinite being, and also we question not, but sincerely believe, the relative properties of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, according to Holy Scripture testimony, Matt. xxviii. 19, and that these Three are One, 1st John v. 7.”—Page 195.

In order that the different denominations of Protestants might avail themselves of the benefit of the act of toleration, they were obliged to subscribe to a declaration of their christian belief. The form required by the committee of Parliament, not being agreeable to Friends, they proposed a substitute; George Whitehead, speaking of the subject, says—

“ Yet to prevent any such from being stumbled or ensnared by some expressions in the aforesaid profession or creed, (which appeared unscriptural) in the said bill, we, instead thereof, did propose and humbly offer, as our own real belief of the Deity, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, viz: ‘ I profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ his Eternal Son, the true God, and in the Holy Spirit, *one God blessed forever*: and do acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, to be given by Divine inspiration.’

“ Which declaration, John Vaughton and I, delivered to Sir Thomas Clergis, who with some others, were desirous we should give in such confession of our Christian belief, that we might not lie under the unjust imputation of being no Christians, nor thereby be deprived of the benefit of the intended law for our religious liberty. We were therefore of necessity, put upon offering the said confession, it being also our known professed principle, sincerely to confess Christ, the Son of the living God, *his divinity*, and as he is the eternal Word, and that the Three which bears record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, are one; one Divine being, one God, blessed forever.”—Page 635. 1689.

To the Question 1st, “ Whether Jesus Christ hath a body, glorified in the heavens, distant and distinct from the bodies of his saints here below?” George Whitehead answers—

ANSWER.—Yea, as a glorified body is distinct from natural, or earthly bodies, and heaven from the earth.

“Second.—Whether the blood that Jesus Christ shed at Jerusalem, is the blood that believers are justified by? Or whether he dies in men for their justification?”

ANSWER.—Both sanctification, forgiveness of sins, cleansing from sin, and justification, are sometimes ascribed to the blood of Christ, and to the spirit of our God, and our Lord Jesus Christ; which effects, works, and manifests the same in all true believers.

“But here are two questions put for one; the first, appears not a scriptural, or proper question; where does the Scripture use those words, viz: ‘the blood that Jesus Christ shed?’ Seeing ‘twas by wicked hands, he was put to death, and his blood shed upon the cross? Yet as the blood of Jesus Christ, is put for, or represents his life, which he laid down, and even the offering and sacrifice of himself at Jerusalem, *that was a most acceptable sacrifice and of a sweet smelling savour to God, for mankind*; respecting his great dignity and obedience, who humbled himself even to the death of the cross, *and gave himself a ransom for all men*, for a testimony in due time; and his *sacrifice, mediation, and intercession, hath opened a door of mercy for mankind* to enter in at, through true repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ, which are wrought in man, (that obeys his call thereto) only by his grace and good spirit unto sanctification and justification in the name and power of our Lord Jesus Christ, who of God is made unto us, wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. God’s great love toward mankind, was manifest, in his dear Son Jesus Christ, and God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, 2 Cor. v. 19.

“The latter question of the second, *is groundless and perverse*. We know neither scripture, *nor minister among us, that asserts Christ’s dying in men, for their justification, but that once he died, that is, for our sins, and rose again for our justification, and that he ever lives to make intercession*; and death has no more dominion over him. Christ Jesus lives and reigns forever in the power and glory of the Father, although some are said to crucify to themselves the Lord of life afresh, and to tread under foot the Son of God, which cannot be taken properly in a literal sense, but by their contempt of truth and doing despite to his spirit of grace, as some *malicious apostates* have done, *not to their justification, but condemnation*.

“What any of us, or among us, have spoken or written of the Seed or Word, which the Son of Man, Jesus Christ, sows in men’s hearts, and of the same being oppressed, or suffering in some, or as being choaked with worldly cares, and the love of riches in others, &c. These and many such like expressions may have been used, according to the parables, and similitudes, which Christ Jesus himself spake, relating to the kingdom of heaven, the word, or seed of life and grace, sown by him in men’s hearts; and likewise of grieving, vexing, and quenching his spirit in them, by their disobedience; and yet by all these *never to intend or mean, that Christ himself*

property dies in men for their justification, although his spirit be both grieved and quenched in many; and many do lose the true sense of his living word in themselves, by suffering their souls' enemy, to draw out their minds from that Seed, that Word, that Light, that Spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ in them, which (in itself, in its own being) never dies. The immortal Seed, the immortal Word, is of an immortal being, though many be dead thereunto in their trespasses and sins."—Pages 149, 150, 151.

"And if God spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also, freely give us all things?"—Rom. viii. 32.

"Jesus Christ showed his own and heavenly Father's great love to all men, as he is the Light of the world, and given for a light unto the gentiles, and to be God's salvation to the ends of the earth; and also in his dying for all men; by the grace of God tasting death for every man; giving himself a ransom for all men, and in making intercession, both for transgressors and for the saints; also according to the will of God, even in Heaven itself, he appears in the presence of God for us, and also by his holy spirit in all true believers: his spirit maketh intercession, helpeth our infirmities, moves and assists us in prayer. They who are sons of God, are sensible that he hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into their hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Galat. iv. 6.

"The humility, mercy, and condescension, of Jesus Christ, our blessed Mediator, are such that he is touched with a feeling of our infirmities, weaknesses and temptations, and ready to succour, help, and relieve all them that are tempted, even by his grace and good spirit in their drawing near to the throne of his mercy and grace.

"O faithful Creator, O King of Saints, O merciful High Priest, O compassionate Mediator, let thy light and thy truth shine forth more and more to the glory of thy great and excellent name and power, and expel the great darkness of apostacy that has covered many nations and professions of Christianity, and greatly appeared in these latter times against thy light, thy truth and people, whom thou hast called and delivered out of darkness, into thy marvellous light. Glory and dominion be to thy great name and power, forever and ever."—Pages 211, 212. 1654.

"I always had a love to the bible, and to reading therein, from my childhood, yet did not truly understand nor experience those doctrines essential to salvation, nor the new covenant dispensation, until my mind was turned to the light of Christ, the living, Eternal Word, the entrance whereof giveth light and understanding to the simple. Yet I do confess it was some advantage to me frequently to read the Holy Scriptures when I was ignorant, and did not understand the great and excellent things or matters therein testified of; for when the Lord had livingly, in some measure, opened my understanding in the Holy Scripture, by my often reading the same before, having the better remembrance thereof, it was a help and advantage to my secret meditations, when a lively sense and comfort of the scriptures was in measure given me by the spirit, and thereby I was the more induced to the serious reading and consideration of

what I read in the Holy Scriptures, and the comfort thereof made known by the Holy Spirit enlightening the understanding: all the promises of God, which are yea and amen in Christ Jesus, being truly comfortable, when applied by the same spirit, for that will make no wrong application thereof; that spirit will never apply peace to the wicked, nor to persons living in their sins, nor tell the unjust that they are just or righteous in God's sight.

"It is through faith, which is in Christ, that the Holy Scriptures are said to make the man of God wise unto salvation, and profitable to him, for doctrine, reproof, admonition, and instruction in righteousness, that he may be perfect, and thoroughly furnished in every good word and work. Doubtless Paul esteemed Timothy's knowing the Holy Scriptures from a child, to be some advantage and help to him, but it was principally through faith, which is in Christ Jesus.

"These things considered, I would not have Christian parents remiss, in educating and causing their children to read the Holy Scriptures, but to induce them, *both to learn and frequently to read therein*, (that is the bible.) It may be of real advantage and profitable to them, when they come to have their understandings enlightened, and to know the truth as it is in Christ Jesus."—Pages 15, 16.

"Question 2.—Whether the scriptures be the rule to try doctrines and spirits?"

"Answer.—*The Holy Scriptures are truly owned and esteemed a rule subordinate to the Holy Spirit*, from which they were given forth, and by the help of the same spirit, doctrines and spirits may be tried; but the spirit is the supreme, universal guide and rule, which affords light and understanding to discern and try both spirits and doctrine, to the truly spiritually minded; for discerning of spirits is a spiritual gift of the Holy Spirit. 1 Cor. xii. 10."—Pages 190, 191.

"When a person, fearing God and loving our Lord Jesus Christ, in sincerity and truth, confesseth his or her real belief, faith or hope, in terms of Holy Scripture, it is sufficient; whether it be of the suffering, death, resurrection or ascension, of our Lord Jesus Christ into heaven and glory, or of his body being spiritual and glorious in heaven. And as the saints being spiritually united to him are his church and body also, and esteemed mystical, while here on earth, so their low or humble body shall be changed and fashioned like unto his glorious body: and of the resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust, and of eternal judgment, according to Holy Scripture; I say, whosoever, fearing God, or friends of truth, are at any time questioned about these things, it will be sufficient and ought to be satisfactory, to answer them in plain scripture language, and keep to the same: and *I would advise all Friends to keep to the words, terms, language, and doctrine of Holy Scripture, and not to be wheedled or drawn from the same, nor suffer themselves to be imposed upon*, either with unscriptural terms or unlearned questions, by any contentious or carping adversaries, whatsoever. For foolish and unlearned questions, as well as profane and vain babbling, must be avoided."—Pages 183, 184.

ISAAC PENNINGTON.

In "An Epistle to all serious professors," he has these remarks :

"The first is concerning the Godhead, which we own as the scriptures express it, and as we have the sensible, experimental knowledge of it. In which there are Three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these Three are One, 1st John v. 7. This I believe from my heart, and have infallible demonstrations of; for I know Three, and feel Three in Spirit, even an Eternal Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, which are but one Eternal God. And I feel them, also One, and have fellowship with them, through the tender mercy of the Lord, in their life, and in their redeeming power. And here I lie low before the Lord in the sensible life, not desiring to know and comprehend notionally; but to feel the thing inwardly, truly, sensibly, and effectually; yea, indeed, this is to me far beyond what I formerly knew notionally concerning them, and I cannot but invite others hither.

"Now consider seriously, if a man from his heart believe thus concerning the eternal power and Godhead; that the Father is God, the Word God, the Holy Spirit God; and that these are one Eternal God, waiting so to know God, and to be subject to him accordingly; is not this man in a right frame of heart towards the Lord, in this respect? Indeed, friends, we do know God sensibly and experimentally, to be a Father, Word, and Spirit, and we worship the Father in the Son by his own Spirit, and here meet with the seal of acceptance with him. Nor would we contend with you about your crimes in this respect, but that ye provoke us thereunto, in laying to our charge, as if we denied the thing; whereas we do not, nor can deny the expressions which the scripture useth, nor our own sense and experience concerning the thing. I pray let this suffice and let us all strive to know God and his Son Jesus Christ, in his life, spirit, and power, wherein is unity and true demonstration, and not contend about such expressions concerning things, as are beside the scriptures. For would not ye yourselves think it hard, (I mean, such of you, as read the scriptures seriously, desiring to understand and observe what is written therein,) to have a belief of things imposed on you, otherwise than is there written, and otherwise than ye have the sense, knowledge and experience of them from the Lord?

"The second is concerning the offering of the Lord Jesus Christ, without the gates of Jerusalem. I do exceedingly honour and esteem that offering, believing it had relation to the sins of the whole world, and was a propitiatory sacrifice to the Father, therefor. And surely he that is redeemed out of the world, up to God, by Christ, cannot deny that Christ was his ransom, and that he was bought

with a price, and therefore is to glorify God, with his body and spirit which are God's, 1st Cor. vi. 20. And saith the apostle Peter, ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold from your vain conversation, &c. but with the precious blood of Christ as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot, 1st Pet. i. 18, 19, who so offered himself up to God through the Eternal Spirit, Heb ix. 14. This we do own singly and nakedly, as in the sight of the Lord; though I must confess we do not lay the sole stress upon that which is outward and visible, (though we truly and fully acknowledge it, in its place,) but upon that which is inward and invisible; upon the inward life, the inward power, the Spirit within; knowing and experiencing daily, that that is it, which doth the work. The outward flesh is not the meat indeed, nor the outward blood the drink indeed, but it is the spirit, the life, the substance, which the birth that is born of the Spirit feeds upon and lives by. Oh! consider seriously, and wait on the Lord rightly to understand that scripture, John vi. 63. It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit and they are life. What doth this scripture lay the stress upon? Is it not upon the quickening spirit, and the words which the quickening spirit speaketh to the soul, which are living, and give life to those that hear them? 'Hear and your soul shall live!' Hear his voice who giveth life and your souls shall live by him; but can any one live without hearing the voice of him, who alone is able to quicken and raise the soul from death and out of the grave of sin?"—Vol iv. pages 450, 452.

In his treatise entitled, "The flesh and blood of Christ, &c." after speaking largely, of that mystical body and blood of Christ, which the saints feed upon, and asserting the necessity of a participation in it, he adds—

"Now as touching the outward which ye say we deny, because of our testimony to the inward, I have frequently given a most solemn testimony thereto; and God knoweth it to be the truth of my heart; and that the testifying to the inward, (from which the outward came,) doth not make the outward void, but rather establish it, in its place and service. God himself who knew what virtue was in the inward, yet hath pleased to make use of the outward, and who may contradict or slight his wisdom and counsel therein? Glorious was the appearance and manifestation of his Son in flesh, precious his subjection and holy obedience to his Father; his giving himself up to death for sinners was of great esteem in his eye! It was a spotless sacrifice of great value, and effectual for the remission of sins: and I do acknowledge humbly unto the Lord the remission of my sins thereby, and bless the Lord for it; even for giving up his Son to death for us all, and giving all that believe in his name and power, to partake of *remission* through him."—Vol. iii. p. 415.

"In the postscript to a work entitled 'Remarks upon some passages in a book, entitled Antichrist's transformations within, &c.' we find the following, viz:

"First, As to his main controversy with Friends about the Christ that died at Jerusalem, he affirming that neither justification nor

condemnation is by him, and reproaching Friends as having gone back to the professors' Christ and Saviour, who died without the gates of Jerusalem; this is in my heart to say—

“Is Christ divided? Is there one Christ that died without the gates of Jerusalem, and another that did not die? Or is it not the same Lord Jesus Christ who died without the gates of Jerusalem, according to the flesh, and yet was then alive in the Spirit? Do we affirm that the Godhead died? (No—we do not so much as affirm that his soul died, as he doth page 19,) but according to the flesh he died; that is, he who was the resurrection and the life, laid down his life, and took it up again according to the commandment of his Father.

“Thus we have been taught of God to believe, and thus to hold it forth. And we have no other Justifier, Condemner, Saviour, or Intercessor than HE that laid down the life of the body, offering it up a sacrifice to his Father without the gates of Jerusalem. ‘Who is he that justifieth? Is it not God, in and through him? ‘And who is he that condemneth? Is it not ‘Christ that died?’ And where did he die? Was it not without the gates of Jerusalem? ‘Yea, rather that is risen again,’ &c. Rom. viii. 33, 34.”—Vol. iv. page 370.

In an essay entitled, “A Visit of Tender and Upright Love,” &c. he says—

“We do indeed really, heartily, singly as in God's sight, own the scriptures; the Scriptures written by the prophets and holy men of God under the law; the scriptures written by the evangelists and apostles in the time of the gospel; and we read them with delight and joy, and would draw no man, from a right reading of them to the benefit of his soul; but only from giving their own judgments on them without the Spirit of God; lest in so doing, they wrest them to their own destruction.

“This is that which the Lord hath drawn us from, and which we know it would also be profitable to others, to be drawn from too; to wit, from imagining, and guessing at the meaning of scriptures, and interpreting them, without the opening of that Spirit from which they were given forth; for they who so do, feed that part, (with a gathered knowledge) which should be famished, die, and perish, that another thing might come to live in them, and they in it.”—Vol. iii. page 184.

RICHARD CLARIDGE,

In his essay on the doctrine of “Christ's satisfaction,” says—

“And as we distinguish between a scripture Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which we unfeignedly believe; and that humanly devised trinity of three distinct and separate persons, which we receive not, because the Holy Scriptures make no mention of it: So we distinguish between scripture redemption and the vulgar doctrine of satisfaction. The first we receive, the second we reject.”—Page 423.

He then proceeds to show the unfairness of Francis Bugg, in his accusations against Friends, for which see pages 35, 38, and 39, of this book. After stating the doctrine of rigid satisfaction, as held by some professors of that day, and ably refuting it, from sound scripture arguments, he declares the belief of Friends, concerning Christ Jesus and his sufferings, in the following words—

“ We do believe that he suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified dead and buried, that he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world, 1 John ii. 2. That it is through his blood that we have redemption, even the forgiveness of sins, Col. i. 14. We do believe that as he was delivered for our offences, so he was raised again for our justification, Rom. iv. 25, and ever liveth to make intercession for us, Heb. vii. 25. We do also believe, that he was and is, both God and man, in wonderful union, not a God by creation or office, as some hold; nor man by the assumption of an human body only, without a reasonable soul, as others; nor that the manhood was swallowed up of the Godhead, as a third sort grossly fancy: But God uncreated, see John i. 1, 2, 3; Col. i. 17; Heb. i. 8, 10, 12. The true God, 1 John v. 20. The great God, Tit. ii. 13. The Lord of glory, James ii. 1. King of kings, and Lord of Lords, Rev. xix. 16. Which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty, Rev. i. 8. The same yesterday, today, and forever, Heb. xiii. 8. And man conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary, see Luke i. 31, 35. Who suffered for our salvation. Hath given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet smelling savour, Eph. v. 2. And by his own blood he entered in once, into the holy place, having obtained, or found, as the word signifies, eternal redemption for us, Heb. ix. 12. It was (see 1 Tim. ii. 5.) the Man Christ Jesus, the one Mediator between God and men, that was conceived, born, suffered, died, and gave himself a ransom for all; for through the Eternal Spirit, he offered himself without spot to God, Heb. ix. 14. Though by wicked hands he was crucified and slain, Acts ii. 23. And in the offering of himself, he was a true and real sacrifice and propitiation for sin, acceptable and satisfactory to God. But he was not a sinner or reputed by God as such; for the apostle saith expressly, That he knew no sin, 1 Cor. v. 21. was without sin, Heb. iv. 15. was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, Heb. vii. 26. But it was by wicked men, that esteemed and condemned him, the Just and Holy One, as a sinner, and numbered him with the transgressors, Isaiah liii. 12.”—Pages 441—443.

He then cites the testimony of some protestant writers, to show that Christ did not so take the sinner's guilt upon him, as to suffer the very *same eternal punishment* that is due to the wicked, and then adds:—

“ As it was the main design of Christ's life, doctrine, and miracles, to call men to repentance, faith, and obedience; so it was also the great end of his sufferings and death, to accomplish the same glorious design. For he gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father, Galat. i. 4. He loved the church and gave himself for it;

that he might sanctify and cleanse it, with the washing of water, by the Word; that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing: but that it should be holy and without blemish. Eph. v. 25, 26, 27. He gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works, Tit. ii. 14. This was a principal end of his giving of himself for us, or offering himself a sacrifice of propitiation for the sins of mankind. For he died for all, that they which live, should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again, 2 Cor. v. 15. This is the argument that the apostle much insisted upon, and for the further enforcing of it, I shall mention but two places more; Ye are bought, saith he, with a price, therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit which are God's, 1 Cor. vi. 20. And you that were sometimes alienated, and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled, in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy, and unblameable, and unproveable in his sight, Col. i. 21, 22.—page 444, 445.

In stating the belief of Friends on the subject of justification, in an argument which he had with an Antinomian Baptist, he says:

“In a word, if justification be considered in its full and just latitude, neither Christ's work without us, in the prepared body, nor his work within us, by his holy spirit, are to be excluded; for both have their place and service in our complete and absolute justification.

“By the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ without us, we, truly repenting and believing, are, through the mercy of God, justified from the imputations of sins and transgressions, that are past, as though they had never been committed; and by the mighty work of Christ within us, the power, nature, and habits of sin are destroyed, that as sin once reigned unto death, even so now grace reigneth, through righteousness, unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord. And all this is effected, not by a bare or naked act of faith, separate from obedience; but in the obedience of faith, Christ being the author of eternal salvation to none but those that obey him.”—page 79. 1699.

The following is the preamble to his last will, dated the 18th of the month called April, 1723, viz:

“Forasmuch as all men, the Man Christ Jesus excepted, have sinned and come short of the glory of God, and there is none other name under Heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved, but that of Jesus Christ, who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification, and is able to save them unto the uttermost, that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them: My faith and hope are in God alone, for the free and full remission of all my transgressions, through sanctification of the spirit unto obedience, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ, who is the Word, the Light, the Way, the Truth, and the Life, the one Mediator and Advocate with the Father, and the propitiation for my sins, and not for my sins only, but also for the sins of the whole world; that being thoroughly washed, sanctified, and justified in his name, and by the spirit of my God, I may be received into that everlastingly glorious rest, which he hath prepared for his

people, not for any works of righteousness which I have done, but according to the exceeding riches of his free grace and mercy, in and through Christ Jesus, the Son of his infinite love, into whose hands I humbly commend my immortal spirit, earnestly and fervently beseeching him, to keep me by his power, through faith, in love to him above all, and to my neighbour as myself, walking, through the assistance of his grace in righteousness and holiness, before him all the days of mine appointed time here upon earth, waiting in patience and resignation to his holy will, and watching and praying always, with all prayer and supplication in the spirit, that my soul may be ready, through his preparing power whensoever my earthly house of this tabernacle shall be dissolved, to enter into that building of God, the house not made with hands, eternal in the Heavens.

“My body I commit to the earth, from whence it was taken, believing that there shall be a resurrection both of the just and unjust.”—Pages 331, 332.

In his “Treatise of the Holy Scriptures,” he thus states the faith of the Society of Friends respecting them, viz :

“We do sincerely and unfeignedly believe the following propositions :

“1. That the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, were not of any men’s private setting forth, but were given by inspiration of God.

“2. That they do contain a clear and sufficient declaration of all doctrines, in common to be believed, in order to eternal life and salvation.

“3. That the Holy Scriptures are the best outward rule and standard of doctrine and practice.

“4. That whatsoever either doctrine or practice, though under pretensions to the immediate dictates and teachings of the spirit, is contrary to the Holy Scriptures, ought to be rejected and disowned, as false and erroneous: For ‘whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of Faith.’—See Art. vi. of the Church of England.

“5. That the Holy Scriptures contain the sayings or words of God, are divine writings, which claim the precedency of all others; and we do esteem them as such ourselves, and under this character recommend them to others.

“6. That there ever was, and is, a most sweet concord and harmony between the teachings of the Spirit, and the testimony of the Holy Scriptures: and that there is no inconsistency or contradiction between the one and the other, notwithstanding that great diversity of men’s opinions and sentiments, under the profession of christianity. For we do believe, that if pride, prejudice, and self-interest were laid aside, and men would, in humility of mind, sincerity of heart, and abasement of self, wait upon the Lord for the teachings of his spirit, they would be taught by him the very truth, as it is in Jesus, and come to know that blessed and heavenly unity in the things of

God, from which they now are so divided and subdivided both among themselves and in opposition to one another.

“7. That, though the manifestation of the spirit, is given to every man, both Jew and Gentile, to profit withal, and the grace of God which bringeth salvation, hath appeared unto all men, so that all have means sufficient afforded them for their present and eternal welfare, if they neglect not the means, nor slight the day of God’s gracious visitation; yet it is a great mercy to us, and all those that make a right use of it, that it hath pleased God to afford unto us the Holy Scriptures, which he hath withheld from many others: And we do believe, that having the advantage of the Holy Scriptures, more is required of us, than of those to whom they are not communicated; for, to whom much is given, from them much is required.

“8. That as the Holy Scriptures have God alone for their author, so the spirit of God alone is their certain and infallible interpreter. For except the spirit which he hath promised, and we ought to wait for, expound them to us, we can never spiritually or savingly understand or apply them. The certain knowledge, therefore, and understanding of them, must be waited for, of the same spirit by which they were dictated and committed to writing.”



EDWARD BURROUGH.

In an essay entitled “Satan’s design defeated, &c.” we find the following accusations and replies—viz.

“They [the Quakers] do deny the doctrine of the Trinity, and that Christ is God and man in one person.

“Answer. As for the word Trinity, it is invented and he hath learnt it out of the mass book, or common prayer book, *but we own the doctrine of the Gospel of Christ, that Christ is God, and the Spirit is God; and there are Three that bear record, the Father, Son and Spirit, and these are one, but God and the Spirit are not persons, but infinite beings, and the Scripture nowhere in true translations expresseth God under the name person, for person is too carnal to express God, and Christ, and the Spirit by: But God was in Christ reconciling the world, and this we believe and acknowledge according to the Scriptures; but for this word, “doctrine of the Trinity,” the Scriptures know no such word, but the truth we own, and the Gospel, and the Scriptures too.*”

“They hold that Jesus Christ died only signally, or exemplarily, and that we are justified by the suffering of Christ in us; and to be healed by his stripes, is to be stripped off or from sin.

“Answer. Jesus Christ died, and rose again, and ascended according to the Scriptures, this we do believe: And Christ was and is the substance, the end of all signs and examples, yet was he an

Example to the Saints; and the apostle exhorted to walk as they had Christ for an example; and while he was in the world, he did, and spoke and acted many things, as parables, signs and examples, the substance of which is to be received in the Saints, and known by them through the Spirit; *and we believe saints are justified by Christ, and through faith in Him*, which was and is and is to come, who is blessed forever; and none are *justified by his death and suffering and blood without them*, but who witness Christ within them; for all are reprobates and to be condemned, and cannot be justified, that have not Christ in them; as thou mayst read, except Christ be in you, you are reprobates, and all that believe in Christ and receive him, *they are healed through his sufferings and stripes*: for he sanctifies them, and gives them remission of sin, and justifies them, and *in him*, the saints are complete, and the new man, the regenerate, is justified; and the old man is in the degeneration, and knows not Christ in him, and hath not received him, but only heard of him without him, and believes the relation: but this faith doth not justify; for all the false christians upon earth have this faith: but that faith alone justifies which gives to receive Christ, and him to live in us, and to dwell in us by that faith.

“ They utterly renounce the doctrine of Justification, by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, or by the obedience he performed, or sufferings he sustained or underwent, in his own person without us.

“ Answer. This is partly true, and partly a lie. We do indeed renounce the profession of Justification, by the imputation of Christ or his righteousness performed without men, by men *while they are in the degenerated estate, and unconverted, and unreconciled, and unborn again*, for by such profession of justification, many deceive their souls: but yet, *we say, that righteousness is imputed to us, and reckoned unto us, who believe in Christ, and have received him; even the obedience and sufferings, that he performed without us, is ours*, who have received him within us, and witnesseth, Christ in us, and therefore we are not reprobates; yet we do acknowledge, he wrought perfect righteousness by obedience, and sufferings without us, and *that righteousness is ours, by faith*; which faith, hath received Christ to dwell in us; and he and his righteousness, his obedience and sufferings, we enjoy in us, in spirit; if any can receive it, let them; for that he wrought righteousness, this is acknowledged: but who have a part in this righteousness, that is disputable.”—Page 515, 516—1659.

The Quakers hold, “ That the Holy Scriptures are not the word of God, nor the saints’ rule of faith and life, neither is it the duty of every one to search them.

“ Answer. The Holy Scriptures that were given forth by the Spirit of the Lord, as holy men of God were moved, they are the words of God, and a declaration and a treatise, Luke i. 1. and that which the saints had handled and tasted of the word of life, that they declared forth in words and writings, Acts i. 1. and the Scriptures as they were given forth by the Spirit of God *are a true declaration of what is to be believed and practised, in*

relation to eternal salvation: It is a true testimony concerning God and his mighty works, and of truth and righteousness; and it is a testimony also of *the devil*, and what he is, and of his deceits and errors, and unrighteousness: So the Scriptures are words given forth by the Spirit, but *Christ is the Word*, that was before the Scriptures were, for in the beginning was the Word of God, and the world was made by it, and the Word shall endure forever, and Christ's name is called the Word of God: And though the Scriptures are profitable, and were given forth to be read, and to be fulfilled, yet they are not the rule and guide of faith and life unto the Saints, but the Spirit of God, that gave forth the Scriptures, that is the rule and guide, the teacher and leader into all truth; and them that are led by the Spirit of God, are the sons of God; and if you walk in the spirit, saith the apostle, you shall live, and as many as walk according to this (to wit, of the spirit) peace is upon them; and so the Spirit of God is the rule of the saint's faith and life; and *the spirit leads them to walk in the fulfilling of the Scriptures, and according to them.*"—Page 514—1659.

In "A declaration to all the world of our faith, and what we believe who are called Quakers," published in 1658, we find the following—

"Again, concerning Christ we believe, that he is one with the Father, and was with him before the world was; and what the Father worketh it is by the Son, for he is the Arm of God's salvation and the very power and wisdom of the Creator, and was, is, and is to come, without beginning or end.

And, we believe, That all the prophets gave testimony of him, and that he was made manifest, in Judea and Jerusalem, and did the work of the Father, and was persecuted of the Jews, and was crucified by his enemies, and that he was buried, and rose again, according to the Scriptures.

"And we believe, He is now ascended on high, and exalted at the right hand of the Father for evermore; and that he is glorified with the same glory, that he had before the world was, and that even the same that came down from heaven is ascended up to heaven, and the same that descended is he that ascended.

"And we believe, even that He that was dead, is alive, and lives for evermore, and that he cometh, and shall come again, to judge the whole world with righteousness, and all people with equity, and shall give to every man according to his deeds, at the day of judgment, when all shall arise to condemnation or justification; he that hath done good shall receive life, and he that hath done evil, everlasting condemnation.

"And we believe, He is to be waited for in spirit, to be known after the spirit, as he was before the world was, and that is the knowledge unto eternal life, which all that believe in him do receive, he subdues death, and destroys him that hath the power of it, and and restoreth from death to life, and quickeneth by his Spirit, all that the Father hath given him: And we believe such he justifieth and sanctifieth, and such are taught of him; but he condemns all that believe not, but continue in unbelief, and are not taught of him. And this we faithfully believe.—Page 440.

FRANCIS HOWGILL.

IN AN Essay entitled "The Heart of New England hardened," replying to one who had misrepresented the Society of Friends, he says—

"First, Concerning the Trinity, thou sayest 'they confess the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and yet they deny the Trinity, and those to be three distinct persons;' for confutation of this, thou bringest Heb. i. & iii. He is the express image of his Father's person.

"Thy Trinity is an old popish term, and we love to keep to sound words; but by Trinity, I suppose thou meanest three, and thy own words shall confute thee. Thou confessest we say, there is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and yet but one God, or one eternal being or substance, in which they all subsist; but thy word 'distinct' is thy own, and not the Spirit's, yet, to distinguish betwixt Father, Son, and Spirit, we deny not; and as for Heb. i. it is in another translation rendered, the express image of his substance; for person is too gross a word, as to express an eternal and Divine Being in; and if thou dost hold three distinct substances, thou errest in thy judgment, for that were to make three Gods."

"Secondly, They deny Christ to be God and man in one person, and Christ to be a distinct person from the Father, and they acknowledge such a Christ, as unchrist's Christ; and when they say, Christ manifest in the flesh, they mean not as the scripture, but fallaciously."

"Answer.—We say, according to the Scripture of Truth, and not according to thy fallacy, that in the man, Christ, did the fulness of the Godhead dwell, and God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, and he saith, I and my Father are one, and the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, subsist in one Eternal Power, Life and Glory, which thou with all thy stupid generation, are ignorant of, and that Christ we acknowledge, is such a Christ as is able to save to the utmost, them that come unto him, and receive him, and believe in him; and is such a Christ as is able to raise them that have been dead, and such a Christ giveth eternal life to them that believe; and so that Christ that we own, doth not unchrist Christ, but by your doctrine, who plead imperfection, and the continuation thereof, and a continuation in sin for term of life, as one of thy own said, 'Sin will dwell in the house, 'til the house be pulled down,' speaking of the natural body, which some other of thy own generation have called, the body of Sin; and so it is you that hold such a Christ as unchrist's the true Christ, in thy own words; and when didst thou enter into our thoughts, and into our heart, or with what dost thou search, that thou sittest as judge over

the heart, who knowest not judgment in thyself, nor what spirit thou art of, and so thy lies and deceit are turned upon thee. When we say, Christ manifest in the flesh, we say that holy thing which was brought forth, and born of a virgin, and conceived of the Holy Ghost, in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwells, in whom the eternal power of the Father was manifested, that he was the Christ which was manifested in the flesh and justified in the spirit, preached among the Gentiles, seen of angels, and received up into glory, and this is according to the Scripture of Truth, and thy judgment must be judged."—Page 303, 304. 1659.

In a treatise entitled "The True Rule, Judge, and Guide of the True Church Discovered," we find these observations, viz :

"Thirdly, The Scriptures testify of Christ, and were written that they might be believed, and received, and read, that thereby every one that believed, might be made wise to salvation, through faith in Christ Jesus, 2 Tim. iii, and instructed in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished with all good works; and whosoever doth teach any doctrines, contrary unto the holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Spirit of God, which dwelt in them; the scriptures are witnesses against such, that they have not the Spirit of God, but are led by another spirit, which brings forth contrary doctrine, and another faith, than was once delivered among the saints; and whosoever brings in, sets up other precepts, constitutions, orders, and practices, in point of worship in opposition and contrary unto those practices, which were held forth in the primitive times, and would set up other traditions than the apostles delivered, either by word or writing, such are manifest to have the spirit of error, and are innovators, and bringers in, of other things as necessary in point of worship among Christians, which the apostles and ministers of Christ, did not see necessary then, and yet they wanted no part of the counsel of God; for Paul said, he had declared the whole counsel of God; and furthermore they said, we have the mind of Christ, and Christ's mind is not variable.

"Fourthly, Though divers of the writings of the prophets and apostles be lost, doubtless, as is evident by divers places of scripture; yet blessed be God that there are those preserved which do bear witness of the one thing absolutely necessary unto salvation; and of the ministrations that were appointed of the Lord, for the church of God to observe, both in the first and second covenants; so that Christians of this last age are not left without example and precedent, which all ought to have an eye unto; and a diligent regard; and though there be divers copies of that which is called the original tongue, and divers translations, yet he unto whom the spirit of God is given, and waiteth in *the measure* of Christ's light, shall receive it; doth see, and shall see the mind and will of God in every age, and the mind and intent of the Spirit in them that spoke forth the Scripture, and can receive the matter therein contained, as though they had heard them speak that spoke it at the first; and though the translators were men, yet I have such an honourable esteem of their labour, that I believe they have not varied

wittingly and willingly from the best copies, that were extant in their age, neither that they were altogether void of the Spirit of God in such a good work, which conduced to the benefit of mankind, but were assisted by it for so good work ; and there be many figures and tropes, improprieties of speech, mysteries and difficulties, yet all these come to be made easy and plain to them that are witnesses of the same spirit that gave them forth ; and though there be diversity of judgments, and professions of religion, one clashing against another, thwarting and contradicting another, and all will seem to bring the scripture for their proof, which yet cannot maintain and prove every thing good, especially when their doctrines contradict one another ; this is granted, it is only *their private interpretation, and not the scripture* ; and for want of that spirit that gave it forth, for that alone, gives the true understanding of it ; and they that are without this, are like to kill one another, about words and names, sounds, titles and iotas, but still want the key that opens, and gives an entrance into the knowledge of the things of God, which alone is the spirit of God that gave forth the scriptures.”—Pages 636, 637. 1665.

GEORGE FOX, THE YOUNGER,

IN his works, page 51, says, “ But further, in the fear and wisdom of God, for the satisfaction of the simple, I do declare, in plain word, that I do believe in the true Christ, the Lord of Life, who was glorified with the Father before the world began, and I do believe that he was in due time made manifest in that body of flesh, who was called Jesus, and that in him the fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily, who was supposed to be the carpenter’s son, whom the Jews crucified without the gates of Jerusalem ; and I have remission of sins through his blood, who is the Lord of Life, and he was buried, but he is risen, and ascended and sits on the right hand of the Majesty on high ; this is the Christ I own, who also was and is crucified in Sodom and Egypt, by the rebellious ; yea, he is crucified afresh, and put to open shame now, by those that trample the blood of the covenant, the Light of Life, under their feet, and count it an unholy, or a natural thing, and such act despitefully against the spirit of grace ; and such murder the seed which keeps the commands of God ; and such will God, the Light, overthrow and burn to ashes, as he did Sodom and Gomorrah ; but all that love and obey the true light, (which is the fire,) shall be saved and preserved by it, and shall remain unhurt ; but all that hate and disobey the light in them, that is their condemnation, the light.”

From a piece entitled “ A message of tender love unto such professors as have attained any true sincerity, simplicity, and zeal for God, in their professions,” &c. we extract the following :

“ Friends, the Eternal Being, which giveth being to all his crea-

tures, hath largely manifested his love unto the world, in giving his Only Begotten to be the Light of the world, (who doth enlighten every one that cometh into the world, that all through him might believe,) and inasmuch as he, in the fulness of time, sent forth his Only Begotten, (full of grace and truth,) into the world, in a body which he hath prepared him, therein to do his will, *which body the only begotten of the Father freely gave and offered up for a sacrifice for sin, and so, according to his grace, he tasted death for every man, and by his offering himself once for all, he hath put an end to all the sacrifices and offerings mentioned in the law, which could not make the comers thereunto perfect, (nor those that offered them,) as appertaining to the conscience: so Christ, the one offering, is become the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, who wrought eternal salvation for all them that obey him: and here is the one offering which perfects forever them that are sanctified.* And he having accomplished the will of the Father, in that body which was prepared him of the Father, (in which he came into the world,) he again left the world, (he not being of the world,) and ascended unto the Father, (from whence he proceeded,) and sate down on the right hand of the Majesty on high. and is now glorified with the same glory that he had with the Father, before the world began; yea, the same that descended into the lower parts of the earth, is also the same that ascended far above all heavens, that he might fill all things: and being one with the Father, and in the Father, and the Father in him, his presence filleth heaven and earth; and being the Son in the Father, he hath power as the Father, to quicken whomsoever he will, that all men might honour the Son as the Father, by whom all things were made that were made, in whom we live, move, and have a being: and he hath a name given him above every name, (to which all things must bow,) which is called the Word of God, or Jesus, because he is a Saviour, and saveth his people from their sins. This is he that is given to be the Head of the body, which is the congregation of the righteous, the fulness of him that filleth all in all; that he, in all things, (*in whom all fulness dwells,*) might have the pre-eminence, being the express substance of the Father's glory, and the very virtue of his being, one with him in nature, and one in name: for as the Father is divine, so the Son is also divine; and as the Father is called the Light, so the Son is also called the Light; the Father is called the Mighty God. so is the Son also; yea, the Son's name is called (Wonderful) the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, (mark that,) the Prince of Peace, of whose government there shall be no end.

“ Now in the Father there is Life, and in the Word, the Son, there is life, and this is one; and this life, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is that one Eternal Spirit, which is not to be limited: yea, God is a Spirit, and Christ is the Lord, that Spirit; yea, he is the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, the quickening Spirit, by whom the free gift is come upon all men, to justify them that believe in the Life: and he that believeth not, he is condemned by the Life, which is the light that doth enlighten every one that cometh into the world: so the gift that is come upon the unbeliever, that condemns him, be-

cause he believeth not in the Light, but loves the darkness better."

To this piece is appended the following note :

"So that none shall be able in the day of the Lord to plead or say, Lord, because our first parents fell from thee, and became dead unto thee, and so were driven out from thy presence, and we being brought forth in this unreconciled state, there was no way left unto us to approach or come near unto thee, to lay hold of the grace that thou offerest unto all, by reason of thine anger ; I say, none shall be able thus to plead : for Christ the Father's love, hath consecrated a way, by his freely giving up himself a propitiatory sacrifice, which appeaseth God, and therefore it is said, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing sin unto them. So, he that perisheth, it shall be for his own sins, nor for his parents ; but because he believed not in Christ, who hath freely made a way for him to come unto God, and by the power of his life visiting him, puts him in a capacity to receive the free grace, which bringeth salvation, which to all men hath appeared."—Works, pages 152, 153, 154, 155. 1660.

George Fox, the younger, wrote the following confession of his faith, in four particulars ; "For the satisfaction of some tender, conscientious persons who had heard false reports of him, and others of his judgment touching the things above written," which are as follows—

"1.—Concerning Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world.

"2.—Concerning justification.

"3.—Concerning the resurrection.

"4.—Concerning everlasting glory and eternal misery.

"First, As concerning Jesus Christ, that was supposed to be Joseph, the carpenter's son, who, as concerning the flesh was crucified, and put to death at Jerusalem, between two thieves, upon the cross at Mount Calvary ; I do believe he was the Son of God ; and that that very body that the soldiers pierced, was the very body that was prepared by the Father for Christ, the true Saviour, to come in, to do the will of the Father that sent him : and I do believe that, by the grace of God, *he tasted death for every man*, that as many as believe in and obey him, whose soul was made an offering for sin, might have eternal life, through him, who gave his precious life a ransom for many.

"Secondly, I do believe that no man can be justified by the works of the law, nor by any work of his own, but he or she that is justified in the sight of God ; it is freely of his grace, *through faith in Christ Jesus*, who creates such unto good works, which God hath ordained, that they that are justified should walk in.

"Now God, through his free love, hath made me a witness of true justification : and I testify in the Lord, that it is not my works that justify me ; but it is the Lord alone, who worketh my works in me, and for me, according to his own good pleasure ; who loved me, before I loved him, and manifested his love to me in the covenant of light, whereby he drew me after himself, and gave me strength to obey and follow him in the manifestation and drawings of his love : which, whilst I did reject, I was justly condemned of the Lord, and

could not witness justification in that state, although I sought it, and talked much of it, as many professors now do: but God, who is rich in mercy and love, showed me how he had given me power and ability to receive his truth in the love of it, through which I am now saved and justified.

“Thirdly, Touching the resurrection: it is a mystery which the carnal mind can never comprehend, but they that come to witness a part in the first resurrection, which is Christ Jesus, the Light of Life; they in his light may come to perceive the mystery of the resurrection; but if truth can be received and understood, then it will appear and be manifested to such, that I do not deny the resurrection: for I do verily believe, that the hour is coming, in which all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of condemnation: but to fools that say that this body of natural flesh and bones shall be raised, I say, that body which is sown, is not that body that shall be; but God giveth a body as it pleaseth him, yet to every seed its own body: now, there is the seed of the serpent, and the seed of Christ; and they that can discern the body of each seed, are not the fools which are questioning how the dead shall be raised, and with what bodies they shall come? for they know all mankind will be found to be one of these seeds, and that every seed shall have its own body.

“Fourthly, Truly, if I did not believe that there was a glory to come, more than what is here, surely although the good presence, peace and consolation of God is in me, and his glory rests richly upon me, yet I should think myself to be in a more miserable condition than very many; but for the glory that is set before me, which Christ in me is the hope of, (which anchors and stays my soul) I am content to endure the cross, and patiently to bear the affliction and sufferings of this present life, not counting them worthy (though ever so great,) to be compared to that eternal weight of glory, which I do believe shall be revealed and given unto me in the world to come.

“And as I do steadfastly believe, that there is a glorious state to be entered into after this life, by all them that shall be found in the immortal seed, wherein they shall be swallowed up of life, glory, and immortality; so I certainly believe, that there is a woful, dreadful, horrible state to be entered into after this life, by all them that shall be found in the seed of the serpent, wherein they shall be swallowed up of perpetual torment and misery, where the worm dieth not, but shall gnaw everlastingly, and the fire goeth not out.”
—Works, pages, 194, 195, 196, 197. 1661.

JOHN WHITEHEAD.

In "A small treatise, wherein is briefly declared some of those things which I have heard, and seen, and learned of the Father, &c."

After speaking of Jesus Christ, the true Light, as the only begotten of the Father, the first born of every creature, which is the beginning and end of all things, the rock of ages which followed Israel in the wilderness, and hath appeared unto all men, &c. he goes on to say:—

"I also saw how in his humiliation he was in fashion as a man, compassed by the virgin's womb, brought forth, and touched with a feeling of our infirmities, yet without spot of sin, perfect in holiness, having the Spirit without measure, and the fulness of the Godhead in him: Yet was he a man of sorrows, rejected of men, judged a blasphemer, and not worthy to live, by the chief priests and pharisees that had the scriptures; and Pilate that had natural learning, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, delivered him to be crucified; and after he had witnessed a good confession before him, he tasted death for every man, of which it was impossible for him to be held; therefore he rose by the power of God, and in divers manners appeared to his disciples: after which, he that descended did ascend far above all heavens into the glory of the Father, with which he is glorified as he was before the world began, having that name, (which is before every name,) that he had in the beginning, which is the Word of God, the Eternal Life, that was with the Father, which doth enlighten men, that through him, who is the Way, Truth, and Life, man may be reconciled and have access unto God, who only hath Immortality, dwelling in the Light to which no mortal eye can approach, and without which no man hath seen or shall see God. Therefore, O man! whose soul is immortal, wait to have its eye opened in the Light, that thou mayest see God, and walk with him in the garden, as in the beginning, before the fall and separation was, or ever the evil eye was open, or the immortal eye overshadowed by death."—Works, pages 93, 94. 1661.

From a treatise entitled "A manifestation of Truth," we extract the following, viz:

"Concerning salvation by Christ, We say and believe, that without the sufferings and death of Christ at Jerusalem, no man can be saved, justified, or sanctified; and therefore do they maliciously, or (at least,) ignorantly, shaver us, who say we expect not to be saved by Christ's sufferings at Jerusalem, but by Christ's sufferings in us; for such words did never proceed from us, though we say that it is not an historical knowledge and belief of what Christ said and suffered at Jerusalem, sixteen hundred years ago, that can or doth save any man without feeling of his Spirit, power, and life made manifest

within, to make them conformable to him in his death, and raise them together with him to live in the virtue of his life, by which life, we, as well as the ancient christians are saved, and we are sanctified and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God, which mightily worketh in us, and all his works are perfect; and therefore, I do distinguish betwixt the righteousness which is of Faith, which the Spirit worketh, and the righteousness which is of the law performed by man's own strength; for though the one be as filthy rags, yet so is not the other; therefore is he the enemy of righteousness that mingles them both together, and treads them under foot as dung and dross; therefore let all that love their souls, love Christ the righteousness of God, and follow after him, that they may be made righteous, and have that boldness in the day of judgment which the ancient christians had, because, (said they) as He is, so are we in this world.—Works, pages 134, 135. 1662.

CHARLES MARSHALL,

In a piece, entitled, “The way of Life revealed, and the way of Death discovered, &c.” speaks thus:—

“The travail in spirit of the messengers and servants of the Most High in ages past, was the same as now it is, viz: To turn people from darkness unto light, and from the power of Satan to the power of the Living God; thereby in no wise invalidating Christ Jesus, his manifestation in that bodily appearance, neither his sufferings, death, resurrection, or ascension; but brings all people, guided thereby, unto that which will open the eyes of their understandings, whereby they all come unto such a condition, and spiritual understanding, as to see and know *their benefit by that appearance of the Saviour of the world; for this we testify, All are perfected by that one offering that are sanctified.* But here ariseth another objection by some, who may come so far as to own and confess, that there is a principle or light in man, that discovereth sin, and teacheth man to do justly and equally, (which some call morality,) but that this light or principle in man is of a saving property, and of the nature and quality of the Divine Being, many for want of understanding do deny, and so are found opposers of truth itself, and stumble at the corner-stone, which indeed in all generations hath been to many men a stone of stumbling and rock of offence, which thousands, (giving themselves up to be guided by their own wisdoms and prudence,) reject; yea, those accounted the wise master-builders, professors of God and Christ, being ignorant of the Root and Offspring of David, have, and yet do reject this corner-stone.

“Now for the sake of all who do or may desire after the true and saving knowledge of Christ Jesus, it is on my spirit yet further to

open and manifest the nature and property of this principle and light; whose Fountain is the Eternal Being, and Everlasting Ocean of Divine Fulness, and its nature and quality is one with this Fountain from which it comes: John testified, In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, &c. In him was Life, and the Life was the Light of men.—He also testified, that he was not that Light, but came for a Witness, to bear witness, that that was the True Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world: so the original of this Light is Christ Jesus, the Word.

“ But some may query thus, Is Christ the Light in every man? To which I answer: Christ doth appear by his light in every man; and the Light which comes from Christ is in every man; as is clearly demonstrated from the Scriptures of Truth; and though I account it unnecessary to answer the curious inquiries of such, (who seeking to know much, do not walk answerable to what they know;) yet for the sake of such, whose understandings are not opened, and yet are inquiring the way to Sion, I add this similitude: The natural Sun is placed by the Creator to lighten the outward world, and doth extend from its body, *a measure* of its light and natural property, shining on the just and the unjust, and so doth daily give forth of that virtue which is inherent in itself; when the sun shineth on any object whatsoever, we sometimes say, the Sun there appears, and other times we say, there is the Sun; the propriety of either of which manner of expressions, I suppose, none will question; for light in that appearance is seen, and virtue is felt, penetrating to the refreshment of our natural bodies; and this light and heat is inseparable from the fulness; and notwithstanding it daily shineth and displays its virtuous life into, and over all the earth and its inhabitants, yet its body is not any way exhausted or altered through ages and generations. And so, I say, that Christ, the universal Fountain of Life, the Sun of Righteousness, the Ocean and fulness of spiritual light, life, and virtue, (from whence *is communicated a measure* of his nature, property, and quality) is given of the Father, to enlighten all the sons and daughters of men, who accordingly are all enlightened with his spiritual appearance, and though *this appearance cannot be called the fulness*, yet being *a measure* of that fulness, it is one in nature and property with, and inseparable from, the fulness; and though through its virtue life is daily communicated unto the sons of men (who waiting for the appearance thereof, as for the morning light, cannot live unto God without it) yet doth he admit of no diminution, alteration or change; but all fulness of divine light, life and glory, doth and shall, through every age and generation, remain with him: and albeit the veil of darkness hath overshadowed the hearts of some, so as when we give testimony unto the universal appearance of the Sun of righteousness, in the hearts of all the sons and daughters of men, they are ready to say, such a testimony leads to the diminishing of that glory and honour which belongs unto him, as he is the Fulness, and sitting at the right hand of the Father; inferring from such our testimony, as if, whilst we testify to his appearance in our hearts, we exclude his presence elsewhere; which

inference, I say, is as irrational, as it would be for any to conclude, that because we say of the shining and appearance of the Sun, there is the Sun; or the Sun there appears; therefore we exclude the Being of the Sun elsewhere. For its virtue is communicated to our natural bodies, every one having in measure, some enjoyment of the virtue or light of the natural Sun, which is light to the eye, even as the outward eye is light to, or of the natural body; and whosoever they are, whose invisible senses are quickened by the influencing virtue which proceeds from the eternal Sun of righteousness, do thereby see and discern, that these things are according to the clear manifestation of Truth in their inward parts; and from a true sense thereof, can of a truth give this certain testimony, that Christ, the Lord, by his holy, quickening spirit, hath appeared in them, to the quickening of their immortal souls; and that through believing in the light, and obedience to his appearance, being come out of that state which is reprobated by the Lord, can of certain experimental knowledge say, Christ is in us the hope of glory. And so when we direct people to this Word, Light, Law, Grace and Spirit, we do not thereby intend, that Christ Jesus, the Light of the World, and Gift of God, is not the true Saviour, Redeemer, and Reconciler of mankind unto God."—Works, page 71 to 77. 1673.

In a piece entitled "A Warning unto the Rulers and People of England, &c." C. Marshall speaks thus—

"In the tender love of God, unto whose ears the misrepresentations, vilifications or aspersion underwritten, have or may come—Give ear, and hear, all you rulers and inhabitants of these northern islands: God Almighty, even the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in this later age of the world is risen and arising, and causing his ancient horn of salvation to be revealed: of whom all the holy men, prophets and servants of God gave testimony, through ages and generations, to be that Holy One, on whom he hath laid help, who is mighty to save, Christ Jesus the Lord; of whose spiritual appearance and coming we are witnesses this day; and by the arm of his eternal power are raised up, to declare him unto these Northern Islands of the Gentiles, as their Light to lighten them, according to the prophet's testimony, of John, old Simeon, Christ Jesus, the Apostles and messengers of God Almighty, through many ages and generations, of which many demonstrative testimonies, in the evidence and demonstration of the spirit and power of Christ Jesus, have been, and are daily borne both by word and writing; against which holy, certain testimonies, men of the spirit of Jannes and Jambres, men of corrupt minds have risen up to withstand, and by lies, slanders, misrepresentings, &c. have endeavoured their utmost to veil and cloud this testimony; which work and way of theirs God hath beheld, and hath determined to blast, because in their right hand hath been found a lie, and the poison of asps is under their tongues, to reproach, vilify, and misrepresent the servants and people of God, under hideous and odious disguises, that they might thereby (as much as in them lies) effect such a work, as the old heathens did on the Christians; namely, by putting lions' skins and bearskins on them, that thereby they might cause the dogs to take hold on them: so hath there been an

endeavour in our day, to misrepresent the servants and people of the Lord, as deniers of salvation by Jesus Christ: making his birth in Bethlehem of Judea, his travails, sufferings, blood, death, resurrection and ascension, of no value; deniers of the scriptures of truth; and instead thereof, preaching up salvation by meritorious works of our own; and in short, representing us as enemies to christianity: concerning which charges, and every particular of them, full, clear and demonstrative answers have been and are given, unto which I refer all unsatisfied persons.—That which lies on my spirit at this time, is to declare in the presence, name and power of the Everlasting God, that these things spoken and written of us, are as false as the accusations of the Pharisees concerning Christ Jesus, and as false as the accusations of the Jews concerning the Apostles—For

“ 1st, We declare to all nations, tongues, and languages, that we believe in the One, Holy, Everlasting God—

“ 2d, We believe concerning him, that he is a spirit; and concerning his worship, that it is in Spirit, and spiritual—

“ 3d, We believe, preach, and publish salvation, in or by no other name, but in, by, and through Him, of whom all the prophets gave testimony, the apostles preached, the primitive saints believed and received, namely, Jesus Christ—

“ 4th, We declare we are so far from denying or having any light esteem of that holy, honourable record, viz. the Scriptures of Truth, that we are often greatly bowed and tendered in spirit, in the sense of the great mercy and love of our God; that although the wicked have been suffered to persecute, revile and evilly to represent the way of life and salvation believed and preached by them, and also have proceeded to kill the bodies of the prophets of God, of Christ Jesus our Lord, his apostles and faithful servants; that yet such hath been his great and unexpressible love, to preserve their precious testimonies unto our age and generation.

“ And now, ye rulers and people of these Northern Islands; in the universal love of the God of the spirits of all flesh, I warn you, that as any thing comes unto your ears of us, contrary to this our faith and belief in God, that you be so noble, as to do that which is but just and equal for you to do, viz. to keep one ear for the accused, to hear with diligence and without partiality: And let none be like those ignoble people of Thessalonica, who being moved with envy, refused to hear the Apostle's doctrine; but be like those worthy Bereans, whose nobility is recorded, because they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, to see whether those things were so or no.”—Works, pages 127 to 130—1674.

HENRY TUKE,

In his tract entitled, “The Faith of the people called Quakers, &c.” p. 24, 25, quotes the following declaration, from a paper

entitled "The Quakers' Vindication," which was presented by Friends to the members of Parliament in 1693—viz.

"We whose names are underwritten, being in christian society with the people called Quakers, do in good conscience, declare and certify all persons concerned ;

"1st. That we sincerely believe and confess that Jesus of Nazareth, who was born of the Virgin Mary, is the true Messiah, the very Christ, the Son of the living God, to whom all the prophets gave witness. And we do highly value his death, sufferings, works, offices, and merits, for the redemption and salvation of mankind, together with his laws, doctrines and ministry.

"2d. That this very Christ of God, was and is the Son of God, that takes away the sins of the world, who was slain and is alive, and lives for evermore, in his divine, eternal glory, dominion, and power with the Father.

"And we know of no other doctrine or principles, preached, maintained, or ever received among or by us, since we were a people, contrary to these aforesaid."

Signed on behalf of the said people by thirty-one Friends.

JOHN BURNYEAT AND JOHN WATSON,

In an essay entitled "The holy truth and its professors defended," make the following declarations, viz.

"He [an opposer,] charges us with denying the Trinity, as he terms it.

"Answer.—*We do really own the Three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are one, John v. 7. And we also own the three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, the water, and the blood, and these Three agree in one, as verse 8, and so we do, and always did believe, according to the Holy Scriptures.*

"He charges us with denying the Scriptures to be the Word of God.

"Answer.—We believe the scriptures to be what they call themselves, a testimony or declaration, as in Luke i. 1. John v. 39. But Christ we own and believe to be the Word of God, according to John i. and Rev. xix. 13. So we own the Word of the Lord, that came unto the prophets, saying, as in Ezek. vii. 1, and in divers other places; and we own and believe the sayings of the Word, as recorded in the Holy Scriptures. So the Word that came unto the prophets was the sayer, or that which spake unto them; and the scriptures are the words or sayings which the Word, or spirit of Christ, spake unto and through the prophets, as is evident from the testimony of the apostle, 1 Peter i. 10, 11."—J. Burnyeat's Works, page 224. 1688.

On page 251. in the same essay, replying to the same opposer, they say—

“ When he saith, ‘ As far as he understands, our principles and practice are according to Christ’s institution, which he doubts not but we will make good upon occasion;’ thou, in answer, sayest, thou knowest our practice well enough: which, if true, and if so bad as thou endeavourest to make people believe of us, why hast thou brought none of them to make good thy charges against us? And as for our principles, thou sayest thou never heard’st we had any. Then thou must needs be ignorant of our way and religion: and therefore, in thy speaking evil of it, thou speakest evil of things thou understandest not, and so art of that generation spoken of, 2 Peter ii. 12. *And as for our faith and principles, they have been published to the world both by words and writing, they have not been hid in a corner;* so that any that had a mind to concern themselves against us, and yet as wise men, would not judge without an understanding, lest like thee, they should speak evil of the things they did not understand, might easily be informed what our principles are. However, we are a people that believe in the Lord Jesus Christ; and that *the Father sent him into the world, to lay down his life a ransom for all men;* that whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have eternal life: that *he was crucified without the gates of Jerusalem, and so became a propitiation for the sins of the whole world:* and that after he had suffered, and was buried, God the Father raised him again by his Eternal Spirit, after which he showed himself unto many witnesses, and then ascended into heaven, and is glorified with the Father, with that glory he had with him before the world was made. And we further believe, that he is the Light of the world, and that he ought to be followed according to his own words, John viii. 12; and that he lighteth every man that cometh into the world, according to John i. 9, and that this light, wherewith he lighteth every man, all ought to believe in, that they may be children of the light, according to John xii. 36. And so we believe in his spiritual appearance, according to his promise who said, He would pray the Father, and he should send them another Comforter, even the spirit of truth, according to John xiv. 16, 17; and *this was his own spirit, for he is the Truth;* and of this the saints were witnesses, as the apostle saith, Gal. iv. 6. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father. And thus was Christ, in the saints, the hope of glory, according to Coloss. i. 7. And thus believing and witnessing the truth of the scripture, we wait upon God for his spirit, that we may worship him therein, according to the institution of his Son, Christ Jesus, as in John iv. 23, 24; and that we may pray with the spirit, and sing with it, according to 1 Cor. xiv. 15. For the apostle exhorted the saints to be filled with the spirit, Eph. v. 18. And the saints were to pray in the Holy Ghost. Jude 20. So our faith stands in the power of God, which is that, the apostle laboured that the saints’ faith might stand in, as thou mayest see, 1 Cor. ii. 5. Believing that there shall be a resurrection, both of the just and unjust, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation, according to John v. 29.”—Pages 251, 252. 1688.

JOHN BANKS,

In a paper, entitled, "A true and faithful testimony for the true and living God, and the all-sufficiency, and unchangeableness of his power and spirit, against the Devil, and his dark power and spirit, by which he rules in the hearts of the children of disobedience, with all his cunning and subtilty in his instruments," &c. writes as follows, viz :

"And now, dear friends, although the devil, the old liar, be at work in this day, in a great mystery, even in the mystery of iniquity, by his evil power and rending spirit, heed him not, nor the strongest of his instruments ; for the power of God is over him and them all, yea, over all that is contrary unto it ; for this is He that was the first, and will be the last, who said, I am the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end ; and he will tread down Satan shortly, and all his agents of mischief ; he was promised to bruise the serpent's head, which daily is a fulfilling, by the dominion of his power and holy spirit, over hell, death, and the grave, and every foul, unclean, dark, quibbling spirit ; for that is appointed for the fire of eternal wrath and judgment, whose end is to devour, kill, and destroy, and make rents and breaches among God's people, where it gets an entrance whatever it pretends, which I am to warn Friends to beware of ; and do say, this is one of the devil's last shifts, to appear *in the name of light* and ancient power and truth, as it was in the beginning ; a transformation to cover his dark power and spirit, which creeps so cunningly in the dark, to deceive the simple on this wise." —Journal, p. 119. 1678.

In an epistle which he wrote to the inhabitants of Carlisle, after earnestly exhorting them to believe in Jesus Christ, as revealed in their hearts by the Holy Spirit, or just Witness for God, which would lead them out of all sin, he adds :—

"Is not this at the door of your hearts to call you to repentance by his light, grace and Holy Spirit ? And if there be not such a believing in him by the same, what availeth his death and suffering to you, *and the shedding of his precious blood for you* ; if sin be not finished here and transgression put to an end ? Ephes. v. 5, and read to the 21st verse. No unclean thing can enter into the kingdom of Christ and of God. *Did not he suffer for the sins of all, that all through him, might believe ?* John iii. 18, and they that believe not are condemned already.

"*I say was not sin the cause, wherefore he suffered ?* and if the cause, sin, through faith in him be not taken away, how shall the effect cease ? But if the cause through faith in him be taken away, then the effect ceaseth, and everlasting felicity, world without end, ensueth."—P. 174. 1684.

JOHN WHITING.

In his address to Edward Ancketyll, on the subject of Tythes, says:—

“ And therefore, Christ being come in the flesh, 1st John iv. 2, and offered up himself a most acceptable sacrifice to God, for the sins of the whole world, in the fulness of time appointed of the Father; and having put an end to all those offerings, and according to the will of God, abolished and changed the law and priesthood, which commanded and took tythes: He is become ‘ the end of the law for righteousness, to every one that believeth,’ in him, Rom. x. 4. I say again, Christ being come in the flesh; and offered up himself through the eternal Spirit, once for all, 2d John 7, he hath put an end to the Levitical Priesthood, tythes and offerings, and is become an High Priest forever, ‘ not after the order of Aaron, but after the order of Melchisedec,’ who is without beginning of days or end of life: not like those priests who could not continue by reason of death, but liveth and abideth a priest forever, to make intercession for us; and such an High Priest becometh us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners: who is made a priest, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life: And is become the minister of the sanctuary, and true tabernacle which God hath pitched, and not man: and dwells not in temples made with hands, Heb. vii. 11, 16, 23, 25, 26; viii. 2, but is long since departed from them. Who, when he ascended up on high, led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; Acts vii. 48; Ephes. iv. 8, 12. Who saith, freely ye have received, freely give, Matt. x. 8. Of whom the Lord saith, This is my beloved Son, hear ye him, Mark ix. 7.”—P. 80. 81. 1680.



A Declaration of the Christian Doctrines of the Society of Friends, issued in 1693.

In the year 1693, the Society of Friends being greatly misrepresented and traduced as denying the doctrines of the christian religion, the following declaration of faith was drawn up, and published by them. After stating the causes which led to its publication, they thus proceed; viz.

“ We are, therefore, tenderly concerned for truth’s sake, in behalf of the said people, (as to the body of them, and for all of them who are sincere to God, and faithful to their christian principle and pro-

feſſion,) to uſe our juſt endeavours to remove the reproach, and all cauſeleſs jealousies concerning us, touching thoſe doctrines of chriſtianity, or any of them pretended, or ſuppoſed, to be in queſtion in the ſaid diviſion; in relation whereunto we do in the fear of God, and in ſimplicity and plainneſs of his truth received, ſolemnly and ſincerely declare what our chriſtian belief and profeſſion has been, and ſtill is, in reſpect to Jeſus Chriſt the only begotten Son of God, his ſuffering, death, reſurrexion, glory, light, power, great day of judgment, &c.

“ We ſincerely profeſs faith in God by his only begotten Son Jeſus Chriſt, as being our light and life, our only way to the Father, and alſo our only Mediator and Advocate with the Father.

“ That God created all things, he made the worlds, by his Son Jeſus Chriſt, he being that powerful and living Word of God by whom all things were made; and that the Father, the Word, and Holy Spirit are one, in Divine Being inſeparable; one true, living and eternal God, bleſſed for ever.

“ Yet that this Word, or Son of God, in the fulneſs of time, took fleſh, became perfect man, according to the fleſh, deſcended and came of the ſeed of Abraham and David, but was miraculoſly conceived by the Holy Gholt, and born of the Virgin Mary. And alſo further, declared powerfully to be the Son of God, according to the ſpirit of ſanctification, by the reſurrexion from the dead.

“ That in the Word, (or Son of God,) was life, and the ſame life was the light of men; and that he was that true light which enlightens every man coming into the world; and therefore that men are to believe in the light, that they may become the children of the light; hereby we believe in Chriſt the Son of God, as he is the light and life within us; and wherein we muſt needs have ſincere reſpect and honour to, and belief in, Chriſt, as in his own unapproachable and incomprehenſible glory and fulneſs; as he is the fountain of life and light, and giver thereof unto us; Chriſt, as in himſelf, and as in us, being not divided. And that as man, Chriſt died for our ſins, roſe again, and was received up into glory in the heavens. He having, in his dying for all, been that one great univerſal offering, and ſacrifice for peace, atonement and reconciliation between God and man; and he is the propitiation not for our ſins only, but for the ſins of the whole world. We were reconciled by his death, but ſaved by his life.

“ That Jeſus Chriſt, who ſitteth at the right hand of the throne of the majeſty in the heavens, yet he is our King, High-Prieſt and Prophet, in his church, a Miniſter of the ſanctuary, and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man. He is Interceſſor and Advocate with the Father in heaven, and there appearing in the preſence of God for us, being touched with the feeling of our infirmities, ſufferings and ſorrows. And alſo by his ſpirit in our hearts, he maketh interceſſion according to the will of God, crying, Abba, Father.

“ For any whom God hath gifted, and called ſincerely to preach faith in the ſame Chriſt, both as within and without us, cannot be to preach two Chriſts, but one and the ſame Lord Jeſus Chriſt, having

respect to those degrees of our spiritual knowledge of Christ Jesus in us, and to his own unspeakable fulness and glory, as in himself, in his own entire being, wherein Christ himself and the least measure of his light or life, as in us or in mankind, are not divided nor separable, no more than the sun is from its light. And as he ascended far above all heavens, that he might fill all things, his fulness cannot be comprehended, or contained in any finite creature; but in some measure known and experienced in us, as we are capable to receive the same, as of his fulness we have received grace for grace. Christ our Mediator, received the spirit, not by measure, but in fulness; but to every one of us is given grace, according to the measure of his gift.

“That the gospel of the grace of God should be preached in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, being one in power, wisdom and goodness, and indivisible, or not to be divided, in the great work of man’s salvation.

“We sincerely confess and believe in Jesus Christ, both as he is true God and perfect Man, and that he is the Author of our living faith in the power and goodness of God, as manifested in his Son Jesus Christ, and by his own blessed spirit, or divine unction, revealed in us, whereby we inwardly feel and taste of his goodness, life, and virtue; so as our souls live and prosper by and in him: and the inward sense of this divine power of Christ, and faith in the same, and this inward experience, is absolutely necessary to make a true, sincere and perfect christian in spirit and life.

“That divine honour and worship is due to the Son of God; and that he is, in true faith to be prayed unto, and the name of the Lord Jesus Christ called upon, as the primitive christians did, because of the glorious union or oneness of the Father and the Son; and that we cannot acceptably offer up prayers and praises to God, nor receive a gracious answer or blessing from God, but in and through his dear Son, Christ.

“That Christ’s body that was crucified, was not the Godhead, yet by the power of God was raised from the dead; and that the same Christ that was therein crucified, ascended into heaven and glory, is not questioned by us. His flesh saw no corruption, it did not corrupt; but yet doubtless his body was changed into a more glorious and heavenly condition than it was in when subject to divers sufferings on earth; but how and what manner of change it met withal after it was raised from the dead, so as to become such a glorious body, as it is declared to be, is too wonderful for mortals to conceive, apprehend or pry into, and more meet for angels to see: the scripture is silent therein, as to the manner thereof, and we are not curious to inquire or dispute it; nor do we esteem it necessary to make ourselves wise above what is written, as to the manner or condition of Christ’s glorious body, as in heaven; no more than to inquire how Christ appeared in divers manners or forms; or how he came in among his disciples, the doors being shut; or how he vanished out of their sight after he was risen. However, we have cause to believe his body, as in heaven, is changed into a most glorious condition, far transcending what it was in on earth, otherwise how could our low

body be changed, so as to be made like unto his glorious body; for when he was on earth, and attended with sufferings, he was said to be like unto us in all things, sin only excepted; which may not be so said of him as now in a state of glory, as he prayed for; otherwise where would be the change both in him and in us?

“True and living faith in Christ Jesus the Son of the living God, has respect to his entire being and fulness, to him entirely as in himself, and as all power in heaven and earth is given unto him; and also an eye and respect to the same Son of God as inwardly making himself known to the soul, in every degree of his light, life, spirit, grace, and truth; and as he is both the word of faith, and a quickening spirit in us; whereby he is the immediate cause, author, object, and strength of our living faith in his name and power; and of the work of our salvation from sin and bondage of corruption: and the Son of God cannot be divided from the least or lowest appearance of his own divine light, or life in us or in mankind, no more than the sun from its own light; nor is the sufficiency of his light within, by us, set up in opposition to him the Man Christ, or his fulness, considered as in himself, as without us; nor can any measure or degree of light, received from Christ, as such, be properly called the fulness of Christ, or Christ as in fulness, nor exclude him, so considered, from being our complete Saviour; for Christ himself to be our light, our life, and Saviour, is so consistent, that without this light we could not know life, nor him to save us from sin or deliver us from darkness, condemnation, or wrath to come: and where the least degree or measure of this light and life of Christ within, is sincerely waited in, followed and obeyed; there is a blessed increase of light and grace known and felt: as the path of the just, it shines more and more, until the perfect day; and thereby a growing in grace, and in the knowledge of God, and of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, hath been, and is truly experienced. And this light, life or spirit of Christ within, (for they are one divine principle,) is sufficient to lead unto all truth; having in it the divers ministrations both of judgment and mercy, both of law and gospel, even that gospel which is preached in every intelligent creature under heaven: it does not only, as in its first ministration, manifest sin, and reprove and condemn for sin; but also excites and leads them that believe in it to true repentance; and thereupon to receive that mercy, pardon, and redemption in Christ Jesus, which he has obtained for mankind in those gospel terms of faith, in his name, true repentance and conversion to Christ, thereby required.

“So that the light and life of the Son of God within, truly obeyed and followed, as being the principle of the second or new covenant, as Christ the light is confessed to be, even as He is the seed or word of faith in all men, this does not leave men or women, who believe in the light, under the first covenant, nor as the sons of the bond-woman, as the literal Jews were, when gone from the Spirit of God, and his Christ in them; but it naturally leads them into the new covenant, in the new and living way, and to the adoption of sons, to be children and sons of the free-woman, of Jerusalem from above.

“It is true, that we ought not to lay aside, nor any way to under-

vaite, but highly to esteem, true preaching and the Holy Scripture, and the sincere belief and faith of Christ, as he died for our sins, and rose again for our justification; together with Christ's inward and spiritual appearance, and work of grace in the soul; livingly to open the mystery of his death, and perfectly to effect our reconciliation, sanctification, and justification; and wherever Christ qualifies and calls any to preach and demonstrate the mystery of his coming, death, and resurrection, &c. even among the Gentiles, Christ ought accordingly to be both preached, believed, and received.

“ Yet supposing there have been, or are such pious and conscientious Gentiles, in whom Christ was, and is, as the seed or principle of the second or new covenant, the light, the word of faith; (as is granted,) and that such live uprightly and faithfully to that light they have, or to what is made known of God in them, and who, therefore, in that state cannot perish, (but shall be saved,) as is also confessed; and supposing these have not the outward advantage of preaching, scripture, or thence the knowledge of Christ's outward coming, being outwardly crucified and risen from the dead; can such, (thus considered,) be justly excluded christianity, or the covenant of grace, (as to the virtue, life, and nature thereof,) or truly deemed no christians, or void of any christian faith in the life and power of the Son of God within, or be only sons of the first covenant, and bond-woman, like the literal, outside Jews; or must all be excluded any true knowledge or faith of Christ within them, unless they have the knowledge of Christ as without them? No sure, for that would imply insufficiency in Christ and his light, as within them, and to frustrate God's good end and promise of Christ, and his free and universal love and grace to mankind, in sending his Son. We charitably believe the contrary, that they must have some true faith and interest in Christ and his mediation, because of God's free love in Christ to all mankind, and Christ's dying for all men, and being given for a light of the Gentiles, and for salvation to the ends of the earth. And because of their living up sincerely and faithfully to his light in them; their being pious, conscientious, accepted, and saved, (as is granted,) we cannot reasonably think a sincere, pious, or godly man, wholly void of christianity, (of what nation soever he be,) because none can come to God or godliness but by Christ, by his light and grace in them: yet we grant if there be such pious, sincere men or women, as have not the scripture or knowledge of Christ, as outwardly crucified, &c., they are not perfect christians in all perfections, as in all knowledge and understanding, all points of doctrine, outward profession of Christ; so that they are better than they profess or pretend to be; they are more Jews inward, and Christians inward, than in outward show or profession. These are christians sincere and perfect in kind or nature, in life and substance, though not in knowledge and understanding. A man or woman having the life and fruits of true christianity, the fruits of the Spirit of Christ in them, that can talk little thereof, or of creeds, points, or articles of faith, (yea, many that cannot read letters,) yet may be true christians in spirit and life; and some could die for Christ, that could not dispute for him; and even infants that die in innocency, are not excluded the grace

of God, or salvation in and by Christ Jesus, the image and nature of the Son of God, being in some measure in them, and they under God's care and special Providence. See Matt. xviii. 2. 10.

"And though we had the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and a belief of Christ crucified and risen, &c., we never truly knew the mystery thereof, until we were turned to the light of his grace and spirit within us; we knew not what it was to be reconciled by his death, and saved by his life, or what it was to know the fellowship of his sufferings, the power of his resurrection, or to be made conformable unto his death; we knew not, until He opened our eyes, and turned our minds from darkness unto his own divine life and light within us.

"Notwithstanding, we do sincerely and greatly value the Holy Scriptures, preaching and teaching of faithful, divinely inspired, gifted and qualified persons and ministers of Jesus Christ, as being great outward helps, and instrumental in his hand, and by his spirit, for conversion, where God is pleased to afford those outward helps and means, as that we neither do, nor may, oppose the sufficiency of the light or spirit of Christ within, to such outward helps or means, so as to reject, disesteem, or undervalue them; for they all proceed from the same light and spirit, and tend to turn men's minds thereunto, and all centre therein.

"Nor can the Holy Scriptures or true preaching without, be justly set in opposition to the light or spirit of God or Christ within; for his faithful messengers are ministers thereof, being sent to turn people to the same light and spirit in them, Acts xxvi. 18. Rom. xiii. 2. 2 Cor. iv. 6. 1 Pet. ii. 9. 1 John ii. 8.

"It is certain, that great is the mystery of godliness in itself, in its own being and excellency: namely, that God should be and was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the gentiles, believed on in the world, and received up into glory.

"And it is a great and precious mystery of godliness and christianity also, that Christ should be spiritually and effectually in men's hearts, to save and deliver them from sin, Satan, and bondage of corruption, Christ being thus revealed in true believers, and dwelling in their hearts by faith, Christ within the hope of glory, our light and life, who of God is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption, 1 Cor. i. 30. And therefore this mystery of godliness, both as in its own being and glory, and also as in men, (in many hid, and in some revealed,) hath been and must be testified, preached, and believed; where God is pleased to give commission, and prepare people's hearts for the same, and not in men's wills.

"Concerning the resurrection of the dead, and the great day of judgment yet to come, beyond the grave, or after death, and Christ's coming without us, to judge the quick and the dead: (as divers questions are put in such terms,) what the Holy Scriptures plainly declare and testify in these matters, we have great reason to credit, and not to question, and have been always ready to embrace, with respect to Christ and his apostles' own testimony and prophecies.

* 1. For the doctrine of the resurrection; if in this life only we

have hope in Christ, we are of all men the most miserable, 1 Cor. xv. 19. We sincerely believe, not only a resurrection in Christ from the fallen sinful state here, but a rising and ascending into glory with him hereafter; that when he at last appears, we may appear with him in glory. Col. iii. 4. 1 John iii. 2.

“But that all the wicked, who live in rebellion against the light of grace, and die finally impenitent, shall come forth to the resurrection of condemnation.

“And that the soul or spirit of every man and woman shall be reserved in its own distinct and proper being, (so as there shall be, as many souls in the world to come, as in this,) and every seed, (yea, every soul,) shall have its proper body, as God is pleased to give it, 1 Cor. xv. A natural body is sown, a spiritual body is raised; that being first which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual. And though it is said, this corruptible shall put on incorruption, and this mortal shall put on immortality; the change shall be such, as flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption, 1 Cor. xv. We shall be raised out of all corruption and corruptibility, out of all mortality; and the children of God and of the resurrection, shall be equal to the angels of God in Heaven.

“And as the celestial bodies do far excel terrestrial, so we expect our spiritual bodies in the resurrection, shall far excel what our bodies now are; and we hope that none can justly blame us for thus expecting better bodies than now they are. Howbeit we esteem it very unnecessary to dispute or question how the dead are raised, or with what body they come: but rather submit that to the wisdom and pleasure of the Almighty God.

“2. For the doctrine of eternal judgment;

“God hath committed all judgment unto his Son Jesus Christ; and he is both Judge of quick and dead, and of the states and ends of all mankind, John v. 22, 27. Acts x. 42. 2 Tim. iv. 1. 1 Pet. iv. 5.

“That there shall be hereafter a great harvest, which is the end of the world, a great day of judgment, and the judgment of that great day, the Holy Scripture is clear, Matt. xiii. 39, 40, 41, x. 15, and xi. 24. Jude 6. ‘When the Son of Man cometh in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered all nations, &c.’ Matt. xxv. 31, 32, to the end, compared with ch. xxii. 31. Mark viii. 38. Luke ix. 26, 1 Cor. xv. 52. 2 Thes. i. 7, 8, to the end, and 1 Thes. iv. 16. Rev. xx. 12, 13, 14, 15.

“That this blessed heavenly Man, this Son of Man, who hath so deeply suffered and endured so many great indignities and persecutions from his adversaries, (both to himself, and his members and brethren,) should at last, even in the last and great day, signally and manifestly appear in glory and triumph, attended with all his glorious, heavenly host and retinue before all nations, before all his enemies, and those that have denied him; this will be to their great terror and amazement, that this most glorious heavenly Man, and his brethren, that have been so much contemned and set at nought, should

be thus exalted over their enemies and persecutors, in glory and triumph, is a righteous thing with God; and that they that suffer with him, should appear with him in glory and dignity when he thus appears at last. Christ was Judge of the world, and the prince thereof, when on earth, John ix. 39, and xii. 31. He is still Judge of the world, the wickedness, and prince thereof, by his light, spirit, and gospel in men's hearts and consciences, John xvi. 8, 11. Matt. xii. 20. Isa. xlii. 1. Rom. ii. 16. 1 Pet. iv. 5. And he will be the judge and final determiner thereof in that great day appointed; God having appointed a day wherein he will judge the world in righteousness by that Man whom he hath ordained. Christ foretold, it shall be more tolerable for them of the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city or people that would not receive his messengers or ministers, &c. Matt. x. 15, and see ch. xi. 24, and Mark vi. 11. Luke x. 12, 14. It is certain that God knows how to deliver the godly out of all their trials and afflictions, and at last to bring them forth, and raise them up into glory with Christ; so he knoweth also how to reserve the unjust and finally impenitent unto the day of judgment to be punished, 2 Pet. ii. 9. He will bring them forth unto the day of destruction, Job xxi. 30. The Lord can and will reserve such impenitent, presumptuous, and rebellious criminals, as bound under chains of darkness, as were the fallen angels, unto the judgment of the great day, Jude 6. Matt. xxv. 30. It is not for us to determine or dispute the manner how they shall be so reserved; but leave it to God, he knows how."

A Postscript relating to the doctrine of the Resurrection and Eternal Judgment.

"At the last trump of God, and the voice of the archangel, the dead shall be raised incorruptible, the dead in Christ shall rise first, 1 Cor. xv. 52. 1 Thes. iv. 16, compared with Matt. xxiv. 31.

"Many are often alarmed in conscience here by the word and voice of God; who stop their ears and slight those warnings; but the great and final alarm of the last trumpet, they cannot stop their ears against, nor escape, it will unavoidably seize upon, and further awaken them finally to judgment. They that will not be alarmed in their consciences unto repentance, nor out of their sins here, must certainly be alarmed to judgment hereafter.

"Whosoever do now wilfully shut their eyes, hate, contemn, or shun the light of Christ, or his appearance within, shall at last be made to see, and not be able to shun or hide themselves from his glorious and dreadful appearance from Heaven with his mighty angels, as with lightning and flaming fire, to render vengeance on all them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, 1 Thes. iv. 16. Matt. xxiv. 27. Luke xvii. 24. Dan. x. 6. Job xxxvii. 3.

"And though many now evade and reject the inward convictions and judgment of the light, and shut up the records or books thereof in their own consciences, they shall be at last opened, and every one judged of these things recorded therein, according to their works, Rev. xx. 12, 13, 14, 15.

‘Signed in behalf of Chrouistian profession and people aforesaid.
 “George Whitehead, Ambrose Rigge, William Fallowfield, James Parke, Charles Marshall, John Bowater, John Vaughton, William Bingley.”

“Now since Francis Bugg, an envious apostate, charged the Quakers with some Socinian notions; and being set on by some churchmen, endeavoured also to render them odious with the government, the following confession of faith, signed by one and thirty persons, of which G. Whitehead was one, was in December presented to the parliament:

“Be it known to all, that we sincerely believe and confess,

“1. That Jesus of Nazareth, who was born of the Virgin Mary, is the true Messiah, the very Christ, the Son of the living God, to whom all the prophets gave witness: and that we do highly value his death, sufferings, works, offices, and merits for the redemption of mankind, together with his laws, doctrine, and ministry.

“2. That this very Christ of God, who is the Lamb of God, that takes away the sins of the world, was slain, was dead, and is alive, and lives for ever in his divine eternal glory, dominion, and power with the Father.

“3. That the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, are of divine authority, as being given by inspiration of God.

“4. And that magistracy or civil government, is God’s ordinance, the good ends thereof being for the punishment of evil doers, and praise of them that do well.”

WILLIAM EDMUNDSON.

In an address to one of the Irish Bishops, has these remarks concerning the Society of Friends:

“Be pleased to hear a few sentences, though in a plain dress, yet true in themselves: *We are Christians*; and hold the Faith and doctrine as delivered by our Saviour Christ Jesus and his apostles, before the apostacy and falling away, *according as it is left on record in Holy Scriptures*, and we are conscientious in our duty, as much as in us lies, to educate and train up our children accordingly.”—Page 254. 1702.

Speaking of himself he says—

“Now in the eighth month, in the year 1704, and in the 77th year of my age, being under much affliction and weakness of body, I was resigned unto the blessed will of the Lord: yet were it his time, would gladly have been dissolved, and at ease, where the weary are at rest, and the wicked cease from troubling. For I was not afraid of death or the grave, but could say, through the tender mercy of God, Death where is thy sting? Grave, where is thy victory? *Through stedfast faith and hope in my Lord and Saviour*

Jesus Christ, who suffered for me, and whom death or the grave could not hold; but rose again, and appears before the Father for me, as Advocate, Mediator, and Interceder; who in my youthful days, was pleased to visit me with the appearance of his holy spirit, to turn me from the evil of my ways, making me sensible of his judgments and mercies, calling me by his grace to a reformation, and also put me into his service, of the ministration of the Word of Life, and doctrine of his kingdom, endowing me with a talent of his Holy Spirit, of understanding in doctrine and discipline, for the benefit of his church, in which I have laboured for the space of above fifty years, according to my strength and ability, through many troubles, deep exercises, and perils of divers kinds, met with by sea and land, which fell to my lot in my line of the Lord's service, both in the wilderness by robbers, and blood thirsty murderers, by open opposers, and enemies to truth, and worst of all, by false brethren under the same profession. These things, and many other great exercises and straits, the Lord's arm and gracious providence have still preserved me through, and supported me over in the faith that gives victory, having blessed his work and given the testimony of his truth, dominion to this present time."—Page 269, 270.

He thus commences an Epistle which he wrote to Friends, viz: "Christ Jesus, the promised Seed, that bruises the Serpent's head, of whom the law and prophets gave testimony, according to the promise of the Father, came in due time, in that prepared body, to do the will of God for man's redemption, which, when he had finished, and tasted death for us, he ascended up on high, and gave gifts to men, and peculiar gifts to believers; to some apostles, to some prophets, and to some Evangelists, pastors, and teachers, discerners of spirits, help-meets in governments, and several other gifts gave he to his gathered flock that believed in him, for the edifying and building them up in the precious faith which he is the Author of, that they may come to the perfect knowledge of God, and Christ, in the measure and stature of the fulness in him, and be established in him, the Head and Foundation, and grow up in him, in all virtue and godliness, in gospel order."—Pages 341, 342. 1694.

JOHN GRATTON,

IN his reply to some queries propounded to the Quakers, by a Clergyman, says—

"Thou beginnest thus: What Jesus Christ is it that he preached? I told thee before, but that it seems would not satisfy thee, and therefore I say,

"That we preach the same Jesus Christ, that was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pi-

ate, was crucified, dead, and buried, rose again the third day, ascended into heaven, and is on the right hand of the Majesty on high, and will come to judge quick and dead; this is our *Intercessor*, *Advocate* with the Father, our *Mediator* betwixt God and man, the Man Christ Jesus; this is He who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption, the Author and Finisher of our faith, our hope of glory, our life, light, strength and salvation; our captain, ensign, deliverer, preserver, and helper; without him we are as nothing, and can do nothing; He is the mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.”—Journal, p. 352, 353. 1703.

“As to thy fifth query, I answer, the revealer of the will of God contained in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, is a sufficient infallible rule of faith and life; and consequently for a good conscience; and all scripture given by inspiration of God, is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness; and is the best secondary rule in the world.”—*Ibid.* 353, 354.

From a treatise concerning the death and sufferings of Christ, we extract the following:

“But some are ready to object, and say, ‘You Quakers do mightily preach up the light within, but you say little of the death and sufferings of Christ, without the gates of Jerusalem, &c.’”

“Answer.—We have many accusers, that say all manner of evil against us, which we patiently bear, knowing it is for his sake, that suffered for us, who is become not only our light, but also our salvation, as we abide in him, as he hath commanded us. And we declare, that as he, by the grace of God *tasted death for every man*; so every man hath this benefit by it; that he may now come to him, receive him, and in him; receive power to become a child of God: therefore when he came into the world, there was great joy, for the angel that appeared unto the shepherds, said unto them, fear not, for behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people; and there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host, praising God and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men.

“Here is universal love, for God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life: So *all the world are put into a capacity by the death and sufferings of Christ*, to come to him, and he that comes to Christ, he will in no wise cast out; for God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that fears him and works righteousness, is accepted of him. So we say it is Christ, that *suffered for us, the just for the unjust*, that he might bring us to God, being *put to death in the flesh*, but quickened by the Spirit, yea, *he laid down his life a Ransom for all*, who himself *bare our sins in his own body on the tree*, that we, being dead unto sin, should live unto righteousness, by whose stripes we are healed; yea, *whilst we were sinners Christ died for us*, and by himself, purged our sins: forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself, likewise took part of the same, that through death he

might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver *them*, who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.

“Thus now I declare, *we own the death and sufferings of Christ*, according to the Holy Scriptures; and that *he, and him only, that suffered without the gates of Jerusalem*, hath been our peace-maker; and is now come by his light, and spirit, to give us the knowledge of God, and what he hath done for us; so that in his light, we see Him who is our Light and our Salvation, as Isaiah said, he hath borne our sorrows, and carried our griefs, which were the sad effects of our sins, so that now, remission of sins that are past, is freely preached unto all men through him, and all mankind are invited to come to him, and all the ends of the earth to look unto him and be saved.”—390, 392. 1690.

In an Essay entitled “Christ is All in All, &c.” after recounting the miracles, and mighty works, and gracious acts of our blessed Lord, while personally on earth, he adds—

“But what shall I say, who can declare the good he did? *It is undeclarable*, his goodness surpasses the understanding of all mankind, he fulfilled the law of Moses to a jot or tittle, and was so holy, harmless, righteous, just and good, that no man could convince him of sin, he was and is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth; *he suffered for us, the just for the unjust*, that he might bring us to God; *he laid down his life, a Ransom for all, and tasted death for every man; he offered up himself a Lamb without spot unto God*, he poured out his soul unto death, and became an offering for sin, and was a propitiatory sacrifice, our passover sacrificed for us, offered up himself once for all, and by one offering hath perfected forever them that are sanctified: those who receive him in the love of God, he works in them and for them, makes them new creatures, quickens them who were dead in trespasses and sins; he is the resurrection and the life, he that believes in me (saith he) though he were dead, yet shall he live; and he that liveth and believeth in me, shall never die.

“He is our Peace-Maker, the Prince of Peace, our Reconciler to God, the Word of Reconciliation; he is the true light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world, he that believeth in him shall not abide in darkness, but shall have the light of life. He is our Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification and Redemption, our Life, Strength, and Way to God, our All in All.

“Oh! the *benefits, advantages, favours, blessings, and mercies accruing, by the coming of Christ into the world*, by his living and dying in it, and for it, perfecting the work of our salvation, without any merit of mankind; for all had sinned, and fallen short of the glory of God, there were none (in that state) righteous, no not one: there were none that did good, they were altogether become unprofitable, the way of peace they did not know, there was no fear of God before their eyes, yet when we were without strength, in due time *Christ died for the ungodly*; but God commendeth his love towards us in that while we were yet sinners, *Christ died for us*; here is the Love, not that we loved him, but God so loved us,

that he gave his only begotten Son, that he by the grace of God should *taste death for every man*: the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if *one died for all men*, then were all dead, and that he died for all, that they who live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him, that died for them, and rose again, so all things are of God, and nothing of man, in this great work of salvation, but all of God, who hath reconciled us unto himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given unto us the ministry of reconciliation, viz: that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us, the word of reconciliation: Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God, for he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.

“Now it appears very fully by the Holy Scriptures, that after Christ had abundantly benefited the world while he lived in it, *he also by his death hath done much good to all mankind, beyond utterance, yea, beyond the understanding of man!* What, to all mankind? Yea, to enemies, to sinners, to ungodly men, as is clear from Rom. v. 6. to the end, as aforesaid, “for if when we were enemies, *we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son*; much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life. So now we joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have received the atonement. Here is good will to men, yea, to enemies.”—Pages 423, 425. 1700.

He thus concludes the Essay—

“Its clear from what hath been said, that Christ is all, in all his people, viz: their wisdom, strength, power, righteousness, light, life, peace, sanctification, justification, consolation and salvation: with him we have all things; without him, we can do nothing: *in him all fulness dwells*; that though he was rich, yet *for our sakes he became poor*, that we, through his poverty, might be rich. And he who is Heir of all things, *was once offered to bear the sins of many*; and unto them that look for him, shall he appear the second time without Sin unto Salvation. Blessed are they who love his appearance: they are ready to say, come Lord Jesus, come quickly. Arise O Lord, and let thy enemies be scattered; make haste and come away. Thy kingdom come, thy will be done.”—Page 432.

JOHN CROOK.

In the year 1698, shortly before the decease of this worthy man, he reprinted a declaration of the *early* faith of the Society of Friends, to which he prefixes the following note, viz.

“It being allowed by some late adversaries, that we are more

sound in the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, than they thought of; yet they persist to object, that we have altered our religion, and that our ancient Friends held grievous errors: I am therefore willing, in the eighty-first year of my age, that this following treatise should be reprinted, *that they may see what myself, with our ancient Friends, held in the year 1663.*

“JOHN CROOK.

“Hertford, the 10th of the 10th month, 1698.”

From the declaration or confession which is entitled “Truth’s Principles,” we extract the following. After speaking largely of the gift of the Holy Spirit, dispensed to all mankind, he adds—

“By this grace and gift within, we believe, that to us, though in the world there be lords many, and gods many, there is but one God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, witnessed within man, only by the spirit of truth, that manifests both the Father and the Son; and these Three are one, and agree in one; and he that honours the Father, honours the Son that proceeds from him; and he that denies the spirit, denies both the Father and the Son, and is antichrist; but he that believes in the spirit, and is led by it, is the Son of God; Rom. viii. 14. ‘And as many as are the sons of God, are led by the spirit of God.’

“We believe, the scriptures bear witness unto, and testify of Christ; but they say, the witness of God is greater than them; the spirit itself bearing witness with our spirits, that we are the sons of God: for it is not the scriptures without the spirit, nor the spirit contrary to the scriptures; but the spirit’s discovering the will of God in the heart, or opening of the scriptures in its own time and way, and not in or by the will of man, but as itself pleaseth, who searcheth all things, even the deep things of God, and manifests them unto the soul, which giveth the perfect, sound, and saving knowledge: for, said Christ, the spirit shall take of mine, and show them unto you: and as holy men gave forth the scriptures, 2 Pet. i. 21, so holy men, and they only, come truly to understand them; and not proud or ungodly, because their hearts and lives do not answer the hearts and lives of those that gave them forth, as face answereth face in a glass. And this we believe to be the reason, why so long preaching, by men of corrupt minds, who have and do handle the words deceitfully, for selfish ends, and filthy lucre sake, hath brought forth so little fruit, and been to so little purpose, except to their purses and bellies; for ‘had they believed, and therefore spoken, and stood in God’s counsel, they should have profited their hearers,’ Jer. xxiii. 21, 22, 23, to the end.

“Through this gift we believe, that Christ Jesus, the Son of God, was manifested in the flesh, in the fulness of time. And this we know by the same spirit, by which our fathers believed he was come, and Abraham saw his day; by the same we do believe he is come, and do see his day; as also by the prophets and apostles’ writings: which twofold cord is not easily broken.

“We believe also, according to the scriptures of truth, that this same Jesus hath God highly exalted, and given him a name above every name, that whosoever believes in him, shall not perish, but

have everlasting life; and that there is not another name, whereby man can be saved, than this name of Jesus Christ; nor is remission of sins to be preached by any other name. But as we do not believe, that the outward letters and syllables are that name, that are to be bowed unto by the outward knee, no more than the letters or syllables in the words, God or Spirit, seeing the scripture saith, 'Unto God, who is a spirit, every knee shall bow,' Isa. xlv. 23. But that name which saves, is the power and arm of God, that brings salvation from sin, and makes every soul that names it, to depart from iniquity. This is that name which was preached, and which is preached, through faith; in which name, remission of sins is obtained: therefore was the outward word Jesus given him, as his outward name; thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins: (mark) for he shall save, &c. So that which saves, is the name, which is to be believed in, which is that arm of God that brings salvation, when no eye pities, neither is there any to help; the power of God that then saves, is that grace that comes from the fulness of Christ the Saviour: and without this virtue, Christ and Jesus are but empty names, 1 Cor. xiii. 3. 'No man can say, that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.'

"We believe also, that *this Jesus died for, or because of sin*, and rose again for the justification of those that believe in him, as well as to manifest to all the world, *that he was the Son of God*, and that he thereby spoiled principalities and powers, and triumphed over them openly, and led captivity captive in his own person; yet we believe and know, by his grace in our hearts, that as his name Jesus, without virtue and power, is but an empty word; so his dying, without man's conformity to his death, or being planted in the likeness thereof, or being crucified with Christ, as saith the scripture, Rom. vi. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Gal. ii. 20. will not profit man, as to the salvation of his soul, no more than the naming of his outward name, Jesus, doth at this day make people to depart from iniquity. For we believe, and are sure, that man must die inwardly, as well as Christ died outwardly, and must be put to death in his flesh, as Christ was, in his: for 'he that is in the flesh cannot please God,' Rom. viii. 8. 'neither cease from sin;' but 'he that is dead, is freed from sin,' Rom. vi. 7. And yet man's dying unto sin, and the root and principle of it in himself, is so far from making void Christ's death in his own person, that it establisheth it to all those ends and purposes, for which it was intended of the Father. As the cures which the physician doth, manifest and establish his skill and ability; so doth man's dying unto sin and self, and living unto God, manifest and establish the virtue and power of Christ's death: for as man manifests his being risen with Christ, by his seeking the things that are above, Col. iii. 1, 2. so doth he manifest his knowledge of the death of Christ, by his being crucified with Christ, and bearing about in his body, the dyings of the Lord Jesus; for as it is not an outward belief, gathered from the letter, that will change the heart and life, though the judgment and opinion it may, so is it not a belief from the history, or letter only, that can give man a saving knowledge of the death of Christ: but he must have the same glory and power of

the Father *in measure*, working in him there, to beget faith in his heart, that he may believe unto salvation from his own filthiness and righteousness, as well as confess with his mouth, Rom. x. and must have that spirit in him, quickening his mortal body, as well as to believe that it was in Christ, 'and raised up him from the dead,' Rom. viii. 11. And this man, whoever he be, bond or free, that thus believes the death of Christ, and its satisfaction to God, as well as its usefulness to man, cannot make it void, nor divide it and its virtue upon the soul that thus knows it: but will say, here is a dying man witnessing the death of Christ, and nevertheless the same man living with Christ, and concluding, if Christ *had not died*, man must have perished in his sin; *this being the way found out by God to recover him*: whereby he knows Christ, and him crucified, and what the preaching of the cross of Christ is, which is foolishness to them that perish, but to them that are saved, the wisdom of God, and the power of God, 1 Cor. i. 18.

"By this gift of God in our hearts, we further believe, that Christ Jesus rose again from the dead, according unto the scriptures, and sits at God's right hand in a glorious body; and we believe that our low estates and humbled bodies, shall be made like unto his glorious body, through the working of his mighty power, whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself; and that this mortal shall put on immortality. For though we believe that Christ Jesus hath lighted every man with his light, whereby man may come to know himself lost and undone, as before is said; yet therefore is not every man saved, though the grace that appears to all men is sufficient in itself; but some have the grace of God bestowed on them in vain, not liking to retain God in their knowledge, though something within them shows them what is good; 'but they reject the counsel of God within, or against themselves, to their own destruction,' Luke vii. 50. (see the margin.) And yet it doth not follow, that the grace is insufficient itself, no more than it follows that Christ's death is insufficient, because he tasted death for every man, and yet every man is not saved. Neither *doth regeneration, or the believing in the light of Christ within, make void the death and sufferings of Christ without at Jerusalem*, no more than believing the scripture-testimony without, concerning Christ's death, makes void the work of regeneration and mortification within; but as the apostle saith in another case, so say I in this, for as the man is not without the woman, neither is the woman without the man in the Lord; *even so is not the death and sufferings of Jesus Christ without at Jerusalem, to be made void and of none effect by any thing within*; neither doth the light within make that of none effect without, but both in the Lord answer his will: for though there is, and may be, a knowledge and belief of what Christ did and suffered without the gates, in his own body upon the tree, and yet sin alive in the heart, and the work of regeneration not known; yet it cannot be so, where the light within is believed on, and obeyed, so as to have its perfect work in the heart, to regenerate and make all things new, and to be of God; *this man can never make void what Christ hath done and suffered without: and yet this new birth, or Christ formed within, and dwelling in the*

heart by faith, doth not limit or *confine Christ to be only within*, and *not without also*, but both within and without, according to the good pleasure of the Father, to reveal and make him known; for, "He fills all things, and the heaven of heavens cannot contain him," and yet he is at God's right hand, far above all heavens, in a glorious body.

"And we also believe the resurrection of the just and unjust, the one to salvation, and the other to condemnation, according unto the judgment of the great day; and then shall every seed have its own body, according to 1 Cor. xv. 36, 37, 38. which we verily believe: for if the dead arise not, we are, of all men, most miserable. But because we dare not be so foolishly inquisitive, as to say, With what bodies shall they arise? Therefore do some say, We deny both the resurrection of the body of Christ, and of all that shall or will be dead: but this also is false; for "every man shall be raised in his own order; but Christ the first fruits," 1 Cor. xv. 23. And we believe they shall be raised with the same bodies, so far as a natural and spiritual, corruptible and incorruptible, terrestrial and celestial can be the same.

"We further believe, according unto the scriptures, concerning faith, That that faith is only true which is God's gift, and hath Christ Jesus, the power of God, for its author and object, and is distinguished from the dead faith, by its fruits: for though in description and definition they may carry a resemblance, yet in nature are as different as a living man is from a dead, which wants not form or shape, but life and power. So saith the apostle James, "As the body without a spirit is dead, so is faith without works;" even so is that faith which stands in the wisdom of words, and not in the power of God: by the one, man is kept in captivity to the world, and the things of it; but by the other he hath "victory over the world," 1 John v. 4. and the seal and witness thereof in his own heart, whereby it is purified, and God is seen; for the pure in heart see God, Matt. v. 8. This faith differs men now, and their worships, as it did Cain and Abel; for, "by faith Abel offered up a more excellent sacrifice than Cain," Heb. xi. By this living faith, Abel saw beyond the sacrifice unto Christ, the first-born of God; beyond the firstling of the flock, which he offered; and therefore God had respect unto Abel and his offering; but God rejected Cain and his offering, though he had faith to believe it to be his duty, yet sticking in the form, and not flying on the wing of faith unto Christ the one offering, he missed the mark, as all have done ever since, that have gone in Cain's way of worshipping, as well as killing men about worship. But we believe that faith to be only true and saving, that flies over self-righteousness, as well as filthiness, unto the fountain of life in Christ; which faith hath nothing of man in it, but is as the breath of life, by which the soul lives; not a bare assent to the truth of a proposition in the natural understanding, but the soul's cleaving unto God, out of a naturalness between Christ and the soul; and so lives rather by relation, than bare credit, or desperate adventure and hazard; not looking at its doing to commend it, but God's love and bounty in Christ the light, to

receive it; and yet holiness is its delight, and he can no more live out of it, than the fish upon the dry land.

“ We believe, That this faith keeps the mind pure, the heart clean, through the sprinkling of the heart from an evil conscience, by the blood of Jesus, which remits the sin, and justifies the soul, through the virtue of this blood received into the heart by this living faith, which receives all its power and virtue from Christ, in whom it abides as its root and object, whereby justification is witnessed “ from sin, not in sin.” Rom. vi. 22. “ But now being made free from sin, and become servants unto God, you have your fruits unto holiness, and the end everlasting life.

“ We believe, That justification and sanctification are distinguished, but not divided: for as he that sanctifieth and justifieth is one, so do these go together; and when the soul hath the greatest sense of justification upon it, through the virtue of the blood of Jesus by the living faith, then is it most in love with holiness, and at the greatest distance from sin and evil; and whenever there is a failing in sanctification, there is also some eclipse of justification in the eye of the soul; until faith hath recovered its strength again, which it lost by sin’s prevailing. For as the farthest and clearest sight is in the brightest day, so is it with the soul, when it is most in the brightness and beauty of holiness, its justification appears most glorious, and its union and communion most sweet and lasting; and so, like two twins, as they are much of an age, so they are like one to the other; and “ what God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.

“ We also by this light believe, That acceptance with the Father is *only* in Christ; and by his righteousness made ours, or imputed unto us: not by the creaturely skill, but by the applicatory act of God’s gift of grace, whereby the soul feels the difference between self-applying by its own faith, and God applying by his Spirit, and so making Christ unto the soul, wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption: so that we believe, and are sure, that there is a great difference between imputation, as it is the act of man’s spirit, and as it is the act of free grace, without man’s forcing. And so we distinguish between imagination and imputation, between reckoning or imputing that is real, and reckoning or imputation that is not real, but a fiction and imagination in the creaturely will and power: and because we are against the latter, we are clamoured upon, as if we denied the imputation of Christ’s righteousness, when it is only unto those that are not made righteous by it, to walk as he also walked: for, as the scripture saith, It is not he that saith he is righteous by the imputation of Christ’s righteousness, but “ He that doth righteousness, is righteous, as Christ is righteous,” 1 John iii. 7. he that believes otherwise is deceived. And yet it is not acts of righteousness, as done by us, nor as inherent in us, as acts, by which we are accepted of God, and justified before him; but by Christ, the author and worker of those acts in us and for us, whereby we know that we are in him, and he in us, and we hold him as our head; into whom all things are gathered together in one, even in him.”

THOMAS ELLWOOD.

George Keith having written a book against Friends, entitled, "The Deism of William Penn and his brethren, &c." Thomas Ellwood replied to it, in 1699, from which we take the following extract :—

"The word Deism being somewhat an uncommon term, may not perhaps be readily understood by every reader. As it has been opposed to Atheism, it has been taken in a good sense ; but as it is now used, it is taken in an ill sense, as importing an acknowledgment or owning of God only ; or of the Godhead, but not of Christ, with respect to his incarnation, or being manifest in the flesh for the redemption of man : So that to charge any one now with Deism, is to charge him with denying that Christ is come and hath suffered in the flesh. Now herein George Keith's both injustice and malice is the greater, in charging William Penn, and his brethren the Quakers with Deism ; inasmuch as he assuredly knows, (which some other adversaries have not had the like opportunity to know, as he hath had,) by certain experience, drawn by so many years intimate conversations with William Penn and the Quakers, in free and familiar conferences, and in reading their books ; that William Penn and *the Quakers both in word and writing, publicly and privately, have always, and on all occasions, confest, acknowledged, owned, as well as believed the incarnation of Christ, according to the Holy Scriptures, viz : 'That the Word was made flesh,' John i. 14. That when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, Gal. iv. 4, 5. That Christ Jesus being in the form of God, and thinking it no robbery to be equal with God ; made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men ; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, Phil. ii. 5, 6, 7, 8. Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the scriptures, 1st Cor. xv. 3, 4. That he was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification, Rom. iv. 25. That he is the propitiation for our sins ; and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world ; 1st John ii. 2. That he ascended up, far above all heavens, that he might fill all things, Ephes. iv. 10. That he is the one Mediator between God and men, 1st Tim. ii. 5. That he is at the right hand of God, and maketh intercession for us, Rom. viii. 34, And is our Advocate with the Father, 1st John ii. 1. And that it is HE which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead, Acts x. 42. These things, I say, George Keith certainly knows, have been constantly held, believed, professed, and*

owned by William Penn, and his brethren the Quakers in general, both privately and publicly in word and writing. These things are so often testified of in our meetings, and have been so fully and plainly asserted and held forth in our books, that we might call in almost as many witnesses thereof, as have frequented our meetings, or attentively read our books."—T. Ellwood's Journal, old ed. pages 443, 444, 445.—Again on page 451, alluding to George Keith, having once been in membership with Friends, he says—

"Yet he himself well knows that neither he, nor William Penn, nor any of the Quakers ever were Deists; *ever did deny, disown, or disbelieve, the coming, incarnation, sufferings and death of Christ, as man, outwardly in the flesh*, his resurrection, ascension, and mediatorship; and he himself has undesignedly acquitted William Penn from his present charge of Deism, by a story he told in his first narrative, p. 38. That upon some urging him to give an instance of one English Quaker, that he ever heard pray to Christ; William Penn being present, said, I am an Englishman, and a Quaker, and I own, I have oft prayed to Christ Jesus, even him that was crucified. This he says, was in the year 1678, which was five years after the publishing of that book, [viz: William Penn's discourse of the General Rule of faith and life,] from which he attempts to prove him a Deist; that is, a denier of the man Christ Jesus that was crucified."

In an "Answer to some objections of a Moderate Enquirer," T. Ellwood says—

"The second objection is, You deny the scriptures to be any rule for man or woman to walk by, so as to direct them to the saving of their souls.

"Answer—In this we are misrepresented. *We sincerely own, love, and regard the Holy Scriptures*, believing with the apostle that they were given by inspiration of God, and are profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works, 2d Tim. iii. 16, 17, and that they are able to make wise unto salvation, through faith that is in Christ Jesus, verse 15. *And great benefit and delight, we find in them*, reading them in the openings of that Divine Spirit by which they were given forth. We are so far from denying them to be any rule, &c. that we acknowledge them to contain many excellent rules, precepts, doctrines, and instructions, directing man and woman, how to walk that they may obtain the salvation of their souls. Yet we do not say, (as some have done,) that the scriptures are the *only* rule, or the *chief* and principal rule: because we dare not give the honour and office of the Holy Spirit, unto the scriptures: for the scriptures themselves declare, that it is the office of the Holy Spirit to guide believers into all truth, John xvi. 13. And indeed the true meaning and benefit of the scriptures themselves is not attained to, in the reading of them, unless the Spirit that gave them forth, do open them, and unseal the *mysteries* contained in them. So that the Holy Spirit is greater than the scriptures, and therefore we cannot but give the chief place unto him. For he is able to manifest himself unto man, and to lead man into the way of salvation, either with and by the scriptures, or without

them as he pleases : but the scriptures cannot do that, without the operation of the Holy Spirit. Justly, therefore, do we affirm the Spirit of God to be the chief rule, and yet acknowledge the Holy Scriptures to be a *true rule*, and proper instrument in the hand of the Spirit to direct men and women how they ought to walk, to obtain salvation to their souls, as the Spirit of the Lord makes use of the scriptures to that end."—Pages 3, 4.

THOMAS STORY,

BEING on a religious visit in America, with Aaron Atkinson, gives the following account, viz :

"The priest was then silent as to that point, [viz. election,] and in an angry manner affirmed, that we as a people deny Christ; and pretended he could prove it, being furnished, as we perceived, with his pretended proof, out of that lying, perverting, scandalous book, called the Snake in the Grass, which as we were informed, he used to read often among his people: and his pretended proof amounting to no more than false accusation, we rejected and exposed it as such. Then his last shift was to call upon us for a confession of our own faith; and directed his demand, to our friend Richard Johns in particular, with whom he was acquainted.

"We denied that he had any authority to make any such demand from us, nor should we, on his own account take any notice of him therein, he appearing as an adversary and perverter; but for the sake of the people, were willing to say, what might be sufficient to satisfy such, as were not prepossessed or prejudiced against us: And then Richard Johns began and proceeded after this manner: *We believe that the Lord Jesus Christ, who was born of the Virgin Mary, being conceived by the power and influence of the Holy Ghost, is the true Messiah, and Saviour; that he died upon the cross at Jerusalem, a propitiation and sacrifice for the sins of all mankind; that he rose from the dead the third day, ascended, and sitteth on the right hand of the majesty on high, making intercession for us, and in the fulness of time shall come to judge both the living and the dead, and reward all according to their works?* All which, being more fully spoken to, by ROGER GILL, we asked the people if they were satisfied with that confession, and they generally, from all quarters, answered, yea, yea, yea; it is full, no man can deny it."—pages 173, 174. 1699.

THEODORE ECCLESTONE,

In his testimony concerning John Crook, says:

“Among other, his faithful brethren, he had a reverent esteem of the coming of Christ, and his sufferings in the days of his flesh, and knew well how to distinguish his great work of redemption and salvation, as he died for all men, or was a sacrifice for sin: and also as he was a sanctifier and redeemer out of sin: the fruit and benefit of the one, being not obtained without the other.

“And were our adversaries duly sensible what great things Christ both doth in us, as well as did for us, surely they would be humbled under his mighty hand, and leave off their slight esteem of his spiritual work in us, and not suppose the one to be in opposition to the other.

“The apostle Peter saith, ‘He bore our sins in his own body on the tree, that we being dead unto sin, should live unto righteousness.’ And how can we die unto sin and live unto righteousness, but by his assistance inwardly manifest in his light, grace, and Holy Spirit.

“Our being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which lives and abides forever, doth not hinder his being made sin for us, who knew no sin, that we may be made the righteousness of God in him.

“Our owning we are sanctified by the work of his spirit, in our inward parts, hinders not our having remission of sins in his name.

“He having left us an example, that we should follow his steps, bars him not at all from being our King, and Captain of Salvation: though he is a condemner of sin in the flesh, yet he is also our Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.

“Our owning him, a sacrifice for sin, hinders not at all, his being our great High Priest.

“Our acknowledging he was tempted in all points, like as we are, doth not prevent his being able to succour us, when we are tempted. Thus our preaching him, the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world, doth not divest him of any of his blessed attributes, or offices, worthily bestowed upon him in Holy Scripture; as the Seed of the woman, the Word, Emanuel, Interpreter, One among a thousand, Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace, Lamb of God, Jesus, Saviour, the very Christ, the Anointed, and many more: yea, he becomes all these to us as we walk in his light, who was given for a Light to lighten the Gentiles, that he might be God’s salvation to the ends of the earth.”—pages 48, 49. 1700.

CHRISTOPHER STORY.

THIS worthy man and his friends having experienced some very rough treatment from the people of Canonsby, in consequence of a misapprehension of the doctrines of the Quakers, addressed a letter to them, in which he declares the nature of the doctrines preached by him at the meeting which had been disturbed by them. We extract the following, viz :

“That there is not another name given under Heaven by which men can be saved, but by the name of Jesus, unto whose name every knee must bow, and tongue confess, either in judgment or in mercy ; and that it was the same Jesus Christ who was born of the Virgin Mary, in Bethlehem in Judea, whose life Herod sought, who, after he had wrought many miracles, suffered the contradiction of sinners, and whose precious blood was shed without the gates of Jerusalem, that tasted death for mankind, that he might be a propitiation for the sins of the whole world ; who was laid in the new sepulchre, rose again the third day ; who after his appearing unto his disciples, as the Scripture makes mention, was received into a cloud out of their sight, and sits at the right hand of the Father. *All which testimonies, recorded in the scriptures of truth, from the time of the Virgin Mary’s being overshadowed by the Holy Ghost, and the child Jesus being brought forth in Bethlehem of Judea, unto that day the cloud received him out of the disciples’ sight, all christians that ever I met with agree in ; and we are of the same belief.* And this being part of what was upon my mind at that time, another thing that followed was, that after Christ Jesus ascended up on high, he gave gifts unto men, some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, &c. (Read the fourth chapter of the Ephesians.) ‘Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, saith the Apostle. And the same Apostle writing to the Corinthians, in chapter twelfth, concerning the diversities of gifts, but the same spirit ; saith, that a ‘Manifestation of the spirit is given to every man to profit withal ;’ and this makes good the words of our Lord and Saviour to his disciples, John xvi. ‘Nevertheless, (saith he,) I tell you the truth ; it is expedient for you that I go away ; for if I go not away, the comforter will not come unto you ; but if I depart, I will send him unto you : And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment, &c., and will guide you into all truth.’

“And seeing that which is to be known of God, is manifested in man, (God hath showed it unto them as in Romans chap. i.) it is our message to you and all people, wherever we come or go, to direct all to the spirit of truth that convinceth of sin, as aforesaid, and

leads into all truth. And this is the word nigh even in thy heart and thy mouth, Rom. x., which the apostle preached; and that every one that hath an ear, might hear what the spirit saith, is no new doctrine, 'for as many as are led by the spirit of God, they are the sons of God,' Rom. viii. 14. Why we should be reviled and abused for exhorting people that have believed in God, and in Christ Jesus, to be led by the Holy Spirit of God, so as that thereby they may work out their own salvation, with fear and trembling; do ye judge: and though we have been unchristianly treated by you, once and again, yet we do suppose you know us not, and therefore we can pray and say in reality, 'Lord forgive them; they know not what they do;' for all that have persecuted God's people in every age, such was their blindness and hardness of heart, that they knew them not, as they were really concerned on the Lord's account."—Journal, pages 82 to 84. 1701.

JOHN STODDART.

JOHN STODDART in his preface to William Edmundson's Journal, has these remarks:—

"The visible dispensations of God to men, have been various, as by angels, the law from Mount Sinai, the ministry of the prophets, and John the Baptist, sent in the spirit and power of Elias, to prepare the way of the Lord: all which dispensations had a glory in them for their time, though but preparative for one more glorious, yet to be revealed. Then in the fulness of time, Christ Jesus the Seed of the woman, the Messiah and Hope of Israel, was manifested in the flesh, whose day many prophets and righteous men desired to see, and could not, only by faith, at a distance, by reason of death.

"Now was salvation brought nigh, the kingdom of heaven at hand, and the glad tidings of the gospel preached to the seed of Abraham, the glory of former dispensations began to wax dim to such as beheld His glory, that excelled, even the glory of the *Only Begotten* of the Father, full of grace and truth; yet many of the Jews could not see it so, nor understand his voice, preaching the kingdom of God in parables, and uttering things that had been kept secret from the foundation of the world; or believe on him, concerning whom, Moses in the law, and the prophets did write; but despised and rejected him, although the mighty works, and great miracles which he wrought among them, by the power of his Father, declared him to be the Son of God.

"Howbeit the most glorious gospel day was not yet fully revealed, at least with respect to the Gentiles, whilst our Saviour was in the prepared body, sent only to the house of Israel, in the form of a servant, to fulfil the law and prophets, and things that were written concerning him; but after he had done that work which the Father

had given him to do, in that *holy body*, and finished the same *by the offering up of himself* unto God, as a Lamb without spot, a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, rose again from the dead, appeared to confirm his disciples, and ascended into glory, at the right hand of his Father: then an open door was set before both Jews and Gentiles, by Jesus Christ, who had consecrated a new and living way through the veil, that is to say, his flesh, and abolished the old covenant, sacrifices, ceremonies and hand writing of ordinances, taking it out of the way, and nailing it to his cross, and openly triumphed over principalities and powers.

“Now the old covenant was to pass away, and the new covenant to be established, and the priesthood changed by the *great High Priest, without sin, and higher than the heavens*, made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but by the power of an endless life; a Priest forever, after the order of Melchisedec; and the law now to go forth of Zion, from the great Lawgiver, and written in the heart, even the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, that sets free from the law of sin and death. Now was the Spirit poured forth from on high in a more plentiful manner upon mankind, than in former dispensations, and eminently on believers; whereby many were qualified and anointed both of Jews and Gentiles, as priests and ministers of the Lord, to attend at his holy altar, in his temple not made with hands, and to offer up spiritual sacrifices, *acceptable to God by Jesus Christ*. And the holy apostles commissioned and endued with power from on high, were to teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, having assurance from Christ, of his being with them to the end of time. And by their ministry, and others whom the Lord sent forth, many were converted to God and added to the church, both of Jews, Greeks, and other nations, being all baptized by one Spirit into one body, or church, which was glorious in that day, as a woman clothed with the sun, having the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars, and she brought forth a Man-child, who was to rule all nations, but he was caught up unto God, and to his Throne, from the great red dragon, that sought to devour him as soon as he was born.”—Page 4 to 7.

“And now the Man-child, the Lord from heaven, is again revealed in many of his saints, who by the breath of his mouth, and brightness of his coming, shall destroy the man of sin, that hath wrought with all deceivableness of unrighteousness, by signs and lying wonders in them that perish. And the true church is returning out of the wilderness leaning on her beloved; and shall again appear in her comeliness and beauty, as a bride adorned for her husband: to her light shall the Gentiles come, and kings to the brightness of her rising, for the glory of the Lord shall arise upon her, and his light shine therein forever. The glorious prophecies of the holy prophets and servants of the Lord, concerning the latter days, must be fulfilled. The knowledge of the Lord shall fill the earth as the waters cover the sea. The abundance of the sea, or multitudes of people shall be converted to Sion, the nations shall flow together to the goodness of the Lord, and be gathered to Jerusalem, that is from above, to worship

the great king, the Lord of Hosts upon his holy mountain, that shall be established on the top of the mountains, and exalted above the hills, and no hurt or destruction shall be there. The Lamb shall lead his people, and feed them in the pastures of life, and bring them to living fountains of water. The Heir of all things shall inherit his right and possess the gates of his enemies, who, in due time, shall all be put under his feet. He shall judge among the nations and rebuke many people. They shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and spears into pruning hooks, and come under the peaceable government of the Lamb. For He is King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, and of the increase of his government and peace, there shall be no end. And blessed be the Lord, many in this day have *in measure*, witnessed the fulfilling of many of these prophecies, (as they relate to particulars) and do know that the Son of God is come, who hath given them an understanding, whereby they know him that is true, and that they are in him that is true, even JESUS CHRIST the true God, and eternal life. in whom all the promises of God, are and shall be fulfilled in their season.”—Pages 10, 11. 1714.

SAMUEL FULLER,

IN his “*Serious Reply*,” to some abusive queries proposed to the Society of Friends, written in 1728, page 27, says—

“We believe the Holy doctrines of the Old and New Testament, to be given by Divine inspiration; and therefore of Divine authority, and preferable to all other writings extant; though we cannot think it any affront or undervaluing of those heavenly oracles, that rare gift, to prefer the mouth and giver whence they came, and which alone can certainly expound, bless, and make them profitable to those great and good ends, which the Almighty, in his mercy and favour, to the Christian Church, above others, has been graciously pleased to vouchsafe and appoint those sacred oracles.

“Forasmuch as the penmen of the Holy Scriptures, particularly of the New Testament, were entrusted to transmit to posterity the transactions, with relation to the birth, miracles, sufferings, resurrection and ascension of our blessed Lord, with the precepts, exhortations, and gracious sayings, that proceeded from his mouth whilst here on earth; as also those excellent and evangelical truths, revealed to them by the light of the glorious gospel, which they were commissioned to preach to the nations; in these respects, and as being prime ministers in God’s house, and persons qualified by a much greater measure of the same divine spirit, to be the first witnesses and dispensers of that glorious dispensation; their writings challenge, and justly ought to have the first and chief place, as a rule of faith and practice, next [to] the holy spirit by which they

were inspired : and which leads us into a high esteem of those excellent writings, as being so valuable an effect of so great a cause.

“ We also believe, the Holy Scriptures contain a *clear testimony to all the essentials of the Christian faith* ; that they are the *only fit outward judge of controversy among Christians* ; that *whatever doctrine is contrary unto their testimony, may therefore be justly rejected as false* ; and that whatsoever any do, pretending to the spirit, which is contrary to the Scriptures, ought to be accounted a delusion of the devil ; for *'tis impossible, that the spirit of God, which we believe all Christians should be led by, should contradict itself, or any of its former revelations in the Holy Scriptures* : hence we are *far from equalling*, much less preferring, our suppositions, speeches, pretences, writings, acts or facts, to the sacred writings, that *we submit all to them, as the only fit outward judge of controversy.*”

On page 82, he says, “ We, sincerely believing the divine inspiration and authority of the Holy Scriptures, cannot deny any thing therein recorded concerning our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, his blood, ascension, and coming again to judgment.

“ We do, we bless God, religiously believe and confess to the glory of God the Father, and the honour of his dear and beloved Son ; that Jesus Christ took our nature upon him, and was like us in all things, Sin excepted ; being wonderfully conceived by the Holy Ghost, his Divinity and Manhood wonderfully united, for in him dwelt the fulness of the Godhead bodily ; he was born of the Virgin Mary at Bethlehem, about 1700 years ago, wrought many wonderful miracles in the land of Judea, lived a life of sanctity and perfect obedience, died the shameful death of the cross under Pontius Pilate, the Roman Governor, whereby he became an offering of atonement, propitiation and full satisfaction for the sins of all men, *on condition of faith and repentance* ; was buried in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea, rose again on the third day, and afterwards ascended into heaven, and sits on the right hand of God, our Mediator, and great Intercessor, and there remains, that heavenly Glorified Man ; who will descend (in like manner as he ascended) to be judge both of quick and dead, just and unjust, at that great, general, and final day of judgment. All which we confirm by the authority of the Holy Evangelists.

To the charge that the Quakers deny any locality to heaven or hell, and that therefore they must in effect deny the eternal rewards and punishments of the life to come, he says—

§ “ No—were that our faith, I would deny the consequence ; but we deny both the premises and the consequences aforementioned : for we believe that heaven is both a place and state of inexpressible and endless joy for the godly ; and hell, a place and state of inexpressible and endless misery for the wicked, and such as forget God ; an earnest of each may be witnessed in this life, but the fulness in the world to come.”—Page 128.

Among other authorities which he cites in proof of this being the belief of Friends, are the following, viz :

“ We do not confine all our expected attainments of heaven and glory, to *within us*, in this life, but the way to attain more thereof

in that which is to come, is to partake of some share thereof in Christ Jesus, even in this life; and where Christ is enjoyed, there heaven and glory is, in measure, spiritually enjoyed, there being inward and spiritual heavens, as well as natural; here we enjoy heaven, or hell but in part; hereafter, in the fulness of endless joy and happiness, or woe and misery.—George Whitehead's Antidote, page 110.

“Question—What is hell? Answer—A place and state of misery, where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched, Mark ix. 41.”—S. Hunt's Instructions for children.

“We own, the one Mediator betwixt God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who maketh intercession for man in heaven, *without us*.”—John Field's True Christ Owned, p. 22.

“In full assurance, that when our testimony is finished, and this mortal life ended, we shall have *a dwelling place* in that kingdom of Glory, which Christ Jesus hath prepared for us, *and purchased by his own blood; by whom we only expect to enjoy the same, when we shall rest from our labours and sufferings, and give glory to our God and to the Lamb, who is worthy of dominion forever. Amen.*” —Testimony to Authority, in 1685.—[See Fuller's Reply, p. 130, 131.]

In the same volume we find the following confession of faith on behalf of the Society of Friends, by Thomas Beaven, viz :

“To give them the true sense of that people (the Quakers) I say, that as I, so they believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, Almighty, All-seeing, Omnipresent, One God, the creator of all things, both in heaven and earth: that the Son, in the fulness of time, came down from heaven, and took upon him, not the nature of angels, but the Seed of Abraham; was born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate, the cruel and shameful death of the cross, to be a propitiation and atonement for the sins of the whole world; but he rose again the third day from the dead, and ascended into heaven, and is the Intercessor, Advocate, and Mediator, between God and man; the King, Priest, and Prophet of his Church, the only Author of Salvation, unto all that obey him, true God and perfect man.

“That the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and the Son, the Lord and Giver of light to the minds and consciences of men; the sanctifier of the heart; the inward comforter of good men, and condemner of evil men, the safe leader into all necessary truth; the guide sent us from heaven to lead us thither. That God hath always had a church or people in the world, consisting of believing and obedient souls, according to the best light, and knowledge received from him, of whatsoever nation or different profession.

“That all the members of Christ's Church are baptized by him, with the Holy Ghost and fire, thereby giving them a new heart and putting a new spirit within them, by which they are born again, and become new creatures.

“That these have communion and fellowship together in the eating the flesh of the Son of Man, and drinking his blood by faith, in receiving and partaking of the bread of God, that comes down

from heaven, and wine of the kingdom, from the immediate hand of Christ, the minister of the sanctuary and true tabernacle which the Lord hath pitched, and not man; these sup with Jesus, and he suppeth with them.

“That God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by Jesus Christ, and that then all in the graves shall hear his voice, and come forth, they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation; then this corruptible shall put on incorruption, this mortal, shall put on immortality; the body is sown a natural body, shall be raised a spiritual body.

“That there is an eternal rest prepared for the people of God, the glorious kingdom and inheritance of heaven, the joys of which infinitely surpass all the pleasure of this world; but as for them that live and die unholy and impenitent, the wicked and all them that forget God, they shall be turned into hell, where is weeping and gnashing of teeth, with torment and that forever and ever.

“That the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are of divine authority, because holy men of God wrote them as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; wherefore they are profitable for doctrine, for reproof, and instruction in righteousness, to the end the man of God may be thoroughly furnished unto all good works, able to make wise to salvation, through faith in Jesus Christ, and that they are therefore the only external rule of faith and manners.”—Pages 144, 145, 146.

ALEXANDER ARSCOTT,

In his treatise on the Efficacy and Internal Evidence of the Christian Religion, says—

“Christianity is a divine institution by which God declares himself reconciled to mankind, for the sake, and on the account of, his beloved Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, and what HE did and suffered for them: on condition of repentance, amendment of life, and perseverance in a state of holiness; for which end he also offers them the help of his grace, and good Spirit, which is sufficient for that end: all which taken together may be called salvation; though in a proper sense, salvation consists in the last, viz. in that help which men receive from the grace and good Spirit of God, according to the words of the Apostle, Rom. v. 10. “If when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.” Again, Ephes. ii. 8. “By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God.” Tit. iii. 5. “According to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.” Now by considering this distinction, it may be observed, that the christian religion so far as concerns the great and good

ends of its institution, consists of two parts ; first, what our Lord Jesus Christ did and suffered for mankind in the days of his flesh *without them* ; and secondly what he did, and continues to do for them, *in them* : or in other words, what they are enabled to do for themselves, through that help and assistance which he is pleased to afford them. The first includes the several particulars of his holy life ; the good works which he wrought, in which, he is our example ; the miracles which he did for the confirmation of his doctrine, and divine mission ; his death, by which *through the appointment of God*, he became a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of mankind ; his resurrection, by which he was fully declared to be the Son of God with power ; all which, though *the effects of them are lasting and permanent*, yet were then done, once for all, and no more to be repeated. But the second, namely, what Christ does for mankind, *in them*, or what they are enabled to do for themselves through his help, in order to repentance and conversion, and perseverance in a life of true piety and holiness ; this being the standing experience of believers in him, throughout all generations, remains to be more particularly considered in this place, being that whereby all the good ends of religion are answered to mankind : the first of these I call, the external, historical part of christianity, the last, the internal, experimental part. And though I consider them for distinction sake, as two parts, yet, as they have a near relation and dependance, one upon the other, they *are not to be divided*, in the influence they have on man's salvation, the one, being the effect or consequence of the other : according to these scriptures, Tit. ii. 14. " He gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." 2 Corinth. v. 15. " He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him that died for them and rose again." So that all the blessings of the gospel, which are comprehended in these particulars, remission of sins that are past, redemption from the power of sin, being purified, sanctified and justified, all are conveyed to us by Jesus Christ, and are the effects and consequence of what he did and suffered in his own person without us, but yet wrought in us, by his good spirit ; which I mention once for all, that when I speak of these experiences, it may be so understood."—New edit. p. 7, 8, 9.



BENJAMIN HOLME.

From a piece entitled a " Serious Call, &c." we extract the following :—

" 1. Concerning the universality of God's Love in sending his Son to die for all men.

" We freely own that it is the duty of the children of men to believe in Christ, as he did outwardly appear ; and we hold it to be

absolutely needful, that they believe his death and sufferings, and what he has done for them, without them, where it has pleased God to afford them the benefit of the Holy Scriptures that declare thereof: yet we believe this outward knowledge is not so absolutely essential to salvation but that men may be saved by the Lord Jesus Christ that suffered upon the cross for them, if they are subject to his Spirit in their hearts, although their lots may be cast in those remote parts of the world, where they are without the benefit of the Holy Scriptures, and may know nothing of the coming of Christ in the flesh; for the apostle Paul in the fifth of the Romans saith, As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men to justification of life; for as all men partake of the fruit of Adam's fall, by reason of that evil seed, which through him is communicated unto them, which inclines them unto evil, although many thousands of them never heard of the fall of Adam, nor of his eating of the forbidden fruit: So we believe many may, and do receive benefit by the Lord Jesus Christ, as they take heed to that divine light and grace, which is communicated to mankind universally, through him, although they may know nothing of his coming in the flesh. Now though we hold it absolutely needful, that men believe in the death and sufferings of Christ, where they have the benefit of the Holy Scriptures that declare thereof, as is before observed; yet all this knowledge will not entitle to a part in the kingdom of God, unless they know him that died for them, to save them out of those things that unfit them for that Holy Kingdom, into which nothing that is unclean can enter.

“But because we bear testimony to the inward appearance of the Lord Jesus Christ, by his light and spirit in men's hearts, some have been so unkind and unjust, that they have not stuck to say, that we denied the Lord Jesus Christ, that suffered without the gates of Jerusalem for us; which is a very great abuse upon us, for we firmly believe in him that was born of the Virgin Mary, that suffered upon the cross for the redemption of mankind universally, *and we are so far from denying him that died for us, and rose again, and ascended into heaven, and is come again by his Spirit into our hearts, that we hold forth his death and sufferings in a far more extensive manner than many others do*; for a great many will have it, that Christ only died for the believers, and a part of mankind; but we believe, according to the scripture that he tasted death for every man: But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour, that he by the grace of God should *taste death for every man*. My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not; and if any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; *and he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world*. Here is the wonderful love of God set forth to mankind universally; Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men to justification of life. So that the plaster is as broad as the sore. Now

although we believe that Christ has by his offering up of himself once for all, cleared the score, so far upon the account of infants and mankind in general, that no man will perish because of the sin of Adam; yet we do not believe that the death and sufferings of Christ without the gates of Jerusalem, will render men justified, and acceptable in the sight of God, except they know him that died for them, to redeem them out of actual sinning, and from those things that unfit them for the kingdom of God: Know ye not saith the apostle, that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? be not deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God; and such were some of you, but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by the Spirit of our God. Here the apostle has clearly set forth how men are justified. Now this is what we are concerned for, that all people may come to know the Lord to work a change in their hearts, and wash them by his Spirit; He saved us by the washing or regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour. Now here is salvation and justification by Christ upon a true and right foundation. And she shall bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins. Mark, that salvation from sin, is the way for men to be saved by Christ, from the wrath to come; for we read that tribulation and anguish will be upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile. There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit. As men come to witness a being washed and sanctified, and brought into Christ, and know their abiding to be in him, they are redeemed out of those things that bring condemnation."—Works, pages 96, 97, 98, 99.

Concerning the Holy Scriptures:—

“Although some have misrepresented us, as though we undervalued or disesteemed the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; yet we do bless the Lord, and have great cause so to do, that the excellent counsel therein contained, which proceeded from the Spirit of God, is preserved upon record to this day; and it is a great favour that we live under a government, where we have the liberty to read them, this being a privilege that many called christians are deprived of, in some other countries; and I wish that all would be frequent in reading of them: The apostle Paul commended Timothy, in that from a child he had known the Holy Scriptures, which, saith he, are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith, which is in Christ Jesus. All scripture given by inspiration of God, is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. Search the scriptures, saith Christ, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me, and ye will not come to me that ye might have life. They are greatly to be valued, in that they

testify of Christ, in whom there is power to give men victory over their corruptions and passions, and enable them to do the will of God; we read that Christ came unto his own, and his own received him not; but as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the Sons of God. They that receive Christ by his Spirit unto their hearts, they receive power; for Christ's Spirit is a christian's strength: I can do all things, saith the apostle, through Christ, which strengthens me. We read, that no prophecy of the scriptures is of any private interpretation: for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God, spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

“ Now we say, the most true interpreter of the Holy Scripture is the Holy Ghost, or Spirit, from which they did proceed. We read, that the natural man receives not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, saith the text, and there is a strong reason laid down for it, because they are spiritually discerned; they are beyond his reach and comprehension; For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him; even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. This is the key which opens the mysteries of the kingdom of God to men; I take this to be the great reason why there are such great mistakes about religion, and why many put such gross constructions upon many parts of the Holy Scriptures, as they do, because they do not come to that divine Spirit which gives a right and true understanding; as Elihu said, There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding. Till men come to the Holy Spirit of God in themselves, they can neither know God, nor the things of God; for we read, that no man knoweth the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him. Now if revelation was ceased as some do image it is, what a sad condition would mankind be in? For we read, the world by wisdom knows not God; there is no knowledge of God, but by the revelation of his Son; and it is as men come to have an inward knowledge of God, that they come to have a right understanding of the Holy Scriptures, which proceeded from the good Spirit of God, wherefore we highly value them; though it is to be feared some called christians do disbelieve many of the great truths therein contained; FOR I BELIEVE THAT A MAN, THROUGH OFTEN REBELLING AGAINST THE HOLY SPIRIT OF GOD IN HIMSELF, MAY ARRIVE AT SUCH A DEGREE OF WICKEDNESS THAT HE MAY REJECT THE SCRIPTURES, AND COUNT THEM BUT FABLES; and may be so far from owning of any thing of God in man, as to deny the Lord that bought him, and according to Psalm xiv. 1. he may say in his heart, there is no God. It is the work of the enemy of all righteousness, to persuade men that there is no God, *and that the Scriptures are but a fiction*, and that men are not accountable for their words or actions, and that there are no future rewards and punishments; that they might walk at large and take their full swing in wickedness.—It is greatly to be desired, if there be any such now living, whose day of mercy is not wholly over, that have arrived to such a degree of hardness and wickedness as this is, that

they may be brought to a sense of their iniquity and error, and be so truly humbled in soul because thereof, that if possible they might find mercy at the Lord's hand. **THE BETTER CHRISTIAN THAT ANY MAN IS, THE MORE TRUE AND REAL VALUE HE HAS FOR THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.**"—Works, pages 105, 106, 107.

Extracts from a volume containing Sermons preached by the early Quakers.

WILLIAM DEWSBURY.

"Away with all your own wills, and your pride and haughtiness, and your hypocrisy and deceit, and all dependency upon any qualification of your own; you must come to have your life separated from you, else you will all perish. Those that will die with Christ, and be willing to die for him, to them he is revealed as a Saviour. *He was before us in the days of his flesh, and complied with his Father's will. He was nailed to the cross.* The Son of God, when he was come to the depth of his sufferings, what was his cry? My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me! *This was for thy sake, and my sake, and every man and woman's sake,* that do believe in him. *He drank the cup which his Father gave him to drink: if it was done thus unto the green tree, what shall be done unto the dry?* He went before us, and when he cometh again, he will take us to himself, and take us from the filth of sin, that we may be made new creatures." Pages 9, 10. 1688.

From his prayer after sermon: "We desire to give thee honour and renown, and praise and thanksgiving, for thy renewed mercies and spiritual blessings *in Christ Jesus, for whom we bless thee, and in whom we desire to be found, not having our own righteousness.* To HIM, *with Thyself,* and thy holy, *Eternal Spirit,* be glory forever. Amen."—Page 18.

RICHARD ASHBY.

In his prayer after sermon: "Lord, thou hast revealed thy glorious arm and power, to thy people, in their many travails, exercises and afflictions, that have come upon them for the trial of their faith, and the exercise of their patience and humility, and other graces. Let our patience have its perfect work, and let the trial of our faith be found unto praise, honour and glory, at the appearance of Jesus

Christ; and let our humility lay us low before thee, that being humbled under thy mighty hand, we may be exalted in due time, *for the sake of Jesus Christ, whom thou hast exalted at thine own right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance to us, and remission of sins.*”—Page 49.

Again on page 50: “Now, Lord, for all thy mercies and benefits, and blessings renewed to us from day to day, and from one season to another, we desire to offer up to Thee, a pure and living sacrifice of praise, and love, and thanksgiving; for thou alone art worthy, who art God over all; *who, with thy blessed Son and Eternal Spirit, livest and reignest forever, and ever, One God, world without end. Amen.*” 1693.

WILLIAM BINGLEY.

“How, and by what means, must sin be done away? God, everlasting, in his infinite love, hath ordained a way, because he would not have man to perish and remain in a state incapable of answering the end which God ordained him to. And what is that way? The Lord Jesus Christ. God hath sent him into the world in a two-fold manner.

First, He sent him into the world in a holy body, which he had prepared for him, as it is written: ‘Lo, it is written in the volume of the book, I come.’ What for? ‘To do thy will, Oh, God!’ What is God’s will? and what is the reason of Christ’s coming into the world? That *he might die for every man, and be a sacrifice for sin, and redeem man to God; this was the work that God gave him to do, in that appearance.*

“Secondly, There is another coming of Christ, a coming in the spirit, for *the first opened a door for lost man, that shut himself out, and by his sin put a bar to his drawing near to God. The first coming of Christ, I say, opened a door, for he became a sacrifice and an offering, and atonement for mankind, and thereby opened a new and living way for man’s coming to God. And his second coming is without sin to salvation; and to bring all mankind that believe and obey him, into this way or door, and to have an entrance into this new and living way, which he has opened; and thereby to have the benefit of that one offering and sacrifice which he hath made for sinners, and God hath revealed and made this known, to the sons and daughters of men.*”

“Blessed be the name of God! that Christ is come in the spirit; that he hath sent his spirit into our hearts; that he hath given us a *measure of his spirit to profit withal. The Son of God is come to wash and purge men from their sins, and to destroy the works of the devil, and to waste and consume that nature, that hath separated man from God, and the root and ground of that, which hath hindered our approaching near to God. Christ is come to finish transgression.*

and to make an end of sin, to take it away, and to bring in everlasting righteousness."—Page 54, 55. 1693.

SAMUEL WALDENFIELD.

“And what if I should say, comparatively, there is a veil over the hearts of many that are called Christians, that hinders them from seeing the beauty and excellency of Christ. They do not know the power of Christ, nor the government of his spirit in their hearts: for people may profess Christianity as long as they will, if they do not know Christ to govern them. they are not true Christians. For one of the prophets among the Jews, could prophecy and foretel of him; let us consider it and find out a right and true interpretation of it, and apply it unto our own souls. Isa. ix. 6. For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace, there shall be no end, the government shall be upon his shoulder. All these appellations and titles are ascribed to Christ Jesus. He hath the government upon him, to lead and guide them in the way wherein they should go.

“Government is an extensive word; it imports government, and authority, and rule. This is applicable to Christ, and teacheth that dignity which was conferred upon Christ, and was really due to him. No man can parallel it, by any expression; there is reason in it, there is justice in it, there is right and equity in it. Christ hath right to reign and rule forever. I do not speak of outward government, but of the government of Christ in the souls of men; and here the devil was the first usurper. He usurped authority in the hearts of the children of men; and Christ was forsaken and deserted; people went from him: for Christ was in the beginning of the world, the world was made by him. Christ’s divinity was from eternity. He was before Abraham was. The world was made by him; and when he was in it, the world did not know him; and when he came into the world, many were not willing that he should reign over them: said the Jews, we will not have this man to reign over us.”—Pages 78, 79.

“I would speak a little of the government of Christ, with some evidence and demonstration, and in a twofold manner, that you might more easily distinguish. There are some Christians that expect that Christ shall come, and reign on the earth, and then they hope to be under his government; but it may be, they are not so careful to mind the present time, and to know his reign and government now. There are another sort of people, whom God, in his infinite mercy hath reached to their consciences, and convinced them that Christ hath a right to reign now. He had a right to reign from the beginning; he

always had a right, never forfeited it, never was deprived of it. He hath a twofold right to reign over the sons and daughters of men.

“The first is, by the right of creation. He created us. None deny, I hope, that the world was created by Christ; therefore he hath a right to govern in it. This is an undeniable argument; no man can gainsay it, that there is a right and justice belongs to him, to rule and govern that which he hath made; therefore it is the most ungrateful and unnatural thing for men to oppose the reign and government of Christ.

“Secondly.—Christ hath a right to reign over the sons and daughters of men, on the account of *his purchase*. He did only create them, but *he did also purchase them*, at the dearest rate, *with the price of his own precious blood!* We were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, or house, land, or earthly treasure; *but with the precious blood of Christ* as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot. *He gave himself to be a ransom for mankind. He tasted death for every man.* One would think that every mouth should be stopped; so there is a twofold right, that Christ our redeemer hath, to reign over us, yet many will not let him reign, nor let him exercise his dominion. What do you think of these? What will become of them?”—pages 81, 82. 1693.

JOHN BUTCHER,

AFTER speaking of the inward and spiritual appearance of Jesus Christ in the soul, he says:

“Friends, I would not be mistaken. I do not preach Christ as the Light of the world, in opposition to his outward appearance, and being manifested in the flesh in that prepared body, wherein he did his Father’s will when he was on earth. *All true christians do esteem and reverence Christ’s appearance in the body, wherein he suffered death, and became a sacrifice for our sins,* as the Apostle saith, Eph. v. 2. Christ hath loved us, and hath given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour.”

“*If I esteem the appearance of Christ in my own heart, I shall be so far from having a light esteem of his bodily appearance, and of his being manifest in the flesh, that I shall admire and reverence the great mystery of godliness; and bless God for the record given thereof, in the Holy Scriptures, which the light of Christ is a key to open; even the great mysteries of the kingdom, which men by their parts and acquirements, cannot attain to.* For God hath not made known these great things *to the wise and prudent,* as we may gather from Christ’s own prayer, Matt. xi. 25. ‘I thank thee oh Father! Lord of Heaven and earth, because those hast *hid* these things from *the wise and prudent,* and hast revealed them unto babes, even so, Father, for so *it seemed good in thy sight.*’”—pages 102, 103. 1693.

JOHN BOWATER.

“I do not question but here are many tender-hearted ones, that have tender desires and breathings of soul after God; that desire to know peace with God and reconciliation with their Maker. Now my friends, *there is not another Mediator, besides Jesus Christ. He is the alone Mediator and Redeemer, it is he that gave himself a ransom for us; it is he that reconciles man to God; and we must be found in him, if we will come to have acceptance with God:* So let every one of you consider with yourselves, how far you are broken off from your evil ways. We are all, by nature, children of wrath; consider how far you are broken off from the wild olive tree, from that which is corrupt by nature, and whether you be grafted into Christ. If thou art grafted into him, thou receivest strength and nourishment and ability from him; and for this end we have waited, after we have believed; we have waited for power.”—page 114. 1693.



FRANCIS CAMFIELD.

“You have often heard by the servants of the Lord, that have given testimony to Jesus, the only and alone Saviour. You have often heard the report, and the report is true, that *there is no name under Heaven, by which any man can be saved, but the name of Jesus.* And you have oftentimes read also in the Holy Scripture, of this Jesus, the only and alone Saviour. All the holy prophets gave testimony that he should come; and when he was come, all the holy apostles and ministers of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, gave testimony that he was come, and they were made able ministers of the New Testament; and their great business was, as instruments in the hands of the great God, to turn men from darkness to light, and from the power of satan to the power of God; that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and an inheritance among them that are sanctified. You know the scripture speaks plentifully after this manner.”—page 135. 1693.

In his prayer, after sermon—“Father of Life! preserve all thine that have waited on thee. Thou art a God that changest not; therefore we are not consumed. Glory, honour, and praise, be rendered to Thee, for all thy love and favour, blessings and benefits, vouchsafed to us, and for all the opportunities which we have had for our souls. Break and soften the hearts of all thy children; and kindle in their souls, a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving—that we may

say, it is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes—that we may rejoice and triumph in thy great salvation *through Jesus Christ, who alone is worthy, and God* over all blessed forever and ever. Amen.”—page 142.

JOHN VAUGHTON.

“FRIENDS, our justification is, indeed, in and through and by the Lord Jesus Christ; for *his sake*, not our own. Any thing that we have done or can do, will not have a tendency to make our peace with God, seeing that we can do nothing ourselves that is acceptable and well pleasing to God. Therefore *we cannot in the least*, as hath been *unjustly charged upon us*, disesteem, or *put a light esteem on what the Lord Jesus Christ hath done for us, in his own person, without us*, nor upon what, by his own power and spirit, he hath wrought in our hearts. But *we believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, both as to his outward appearance, as he was God manifest in the flesh, and also in his inward and spiritual appearance in our souls.*

“We believe in him that hath appeared by his light, and grace, and truth, in our hearts; and we know the effectual working and operation of the Divine Power to sanctify, and cleanse, and purify our souls. And thereby we come to have a real sense of the benefit and advantage that the souls of the children of men have, in and by the death and sufferings, resurrection, and ascension, of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.”—pages 155, 156, 157.

“Till people come to believe in his spiritual appearance by his light and grace, and truth, in our hearts, and to receive him and entertain him, and let him have a place in their souls, that he by his power may purge away sin and transgression; while men remain rebellious and stubborn, and will not let him in when he stands and knocks at the door of their hearts, that he come in and sup with them, and they with him—when men rebel against his heavenly light with them, and turn away from his divine grace and holy spirit, and turn the grace of God into wantonness, lasciviousness, and men into uncleanness, drunkenness, pride, envy, malice, and bitterness, and into those things that are abominable and evil in the sight of the Lord; these men have no real advantage or benefit by the death and sufferings of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the satisfaction and atonement he hath made for our sins, by that one offering and sacrifice of himself. And they do not truly know the blessed end and design of his appearance and coming into the world: For this purpose was the Son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil; that he might finish transgression, and make an end of sin, and bring in everlasting righteousness.”

“When we come to believe in the inward and spiritual appearance of Christ, and to know the work of sanctification, WE CANNOT

HAVE A SLIGHT ESTEEM OF, NOR DISBELIEVE OR UNDERVALUE, *what the Lord Jesus Christ hath done without us, in his person*; for we shall come to find the benefit, gain, advantage, and profit of it, redounding to our souls, through *that one offering*, when *he offered himself*, through the eternal Spirit, as a Lamb without spot. He offered himself once for all, and we have the benefit of it, when we come to receive him, live in obedience to him, and answer his requiring, and walk in the spirit. And then as the apostle saith, if we walk in the spirit, we shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh; for all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, and is not of the Father, but is of the world, and the world passeth away, and the lust thereof, but he that doth the will of God abideth forever.”—Pages 158, 159. 1694.

JAMES PARK.

“ Now, my friends, hearken and incline your ears from time to time, unto what the Lord shall say. He will speak peace unto his people and to his saints; but let them not return again unto folly. Whoever you are that are *true, real, Christians*, you have peace with God, *through Christ Jesus, the peaceable Saviour*. *We are accepted of God, IN THE BELOVED*, and have peace with God, *in and through Christ Jesus*, who is the great peace-maker and Prince of Peace. *It is by his meritorious death, and sufferings, and satisfaction made to Divine Justice, that we are reconciled unto God*. I never did desire to hear any thing, or speak any thing, *that had the least tendency to undervalue the death, sufferings, satisfaction, mediation and intercession of our Lord Jesus Christ*; but have always owned, believed, and preached these great truths.”—Pages 178, 179. 1694.

FRANCIS STAMPER,

IN a Sermon preached at Devonshire House, 5th mo. 3d, 1594, says thus—

God hath laid help upon one that is mighty, to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him.

“ This Mighty one, that the Almighty Lord Jehovah hath laid help upon for man, is the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of his love; and they are blessed of God that come to partake of the help that is in him, who said to his disciples in the days past, *without me ye can do nothing*.” Friends this is a deep and a very near word; and it stands us all upon to consider whether we have him or not; for we all

owe service, a duty, and a worship, to the everlasting God, and of ourselves we cannot perform it, without the help and assistance of his beloved Son, the Lord Jesus Christ; and the comfort of all that believe in him, is this, that He is not only able to help, but willing to help."

"And O Friends! what greater love could the Lord God have shown to the lost sons of Adam, than to have sent his Son, '*his only begotten Son*, from the bosom of his heavenly love, to redeem man up to God again—to restore man again—and bring him back again out of that alienated state, and out of that undone condition, that He was fallen into, by his disobedience and transgression against the Lord. *God hath laid help upon one that is mighty, able to save.* Therefore, children of Sion, look unto *the Lord Jesus Christ, that mighty one*, upon whom help is laid, in whom is *divine strength and power*, and from whom you may have divine assistance, that we may perform the good which is required at our hands, and which is incumbent upon us, and which we owe to our Creator—that we may worship Him from day to day, and from one time to another."



We shall conclude with the following extract from a declaration of the ancient faith of the Society of Friends, viz.

"*The Primitive Testimony of the people called Quakers, &c.*

"Dear Friends,—To have right sentiments of God the great Author of our being, and of our duty to him as men and christians, and to believe, live and act accordingly, is without doubt a matter of the greatest consequence to us, respecting our happiness in this life, and that life which is to come. And as we fervently desire that this happiness may be the lot and portion of all mankind, and especially those who with us make profession of the christian religion, and of that holy principle of grace and truth, which, through Jesus Christ, is given to mankind, for their instruction, help and preservation in the things of God, and in the way of virtue and godliness; we are at this time concerned in that love of God, which seeks the good of all, to recommend a few necessary things to your serious consideration; in order that both christian knowledge and practice may be maintained and increased among us, as a people, for the good of ourselves and our posterity after us.

"In the first place then (not to enter into the various opinions of men of nice speculation and curiosity, which have tended rather to perplex peoples minds, than to build them up in christian knowledge) these are evidently right sentiments of God, to believe him to be a Being of infinite purity and goodness, as well as wisdom and power. And therefore in order that mankind may be acceptable to him, 'tis necessary that they should be pure also. And as it is evident that all men have, more or less, sinned, and fallen short of this state, in order to redeem them from it, and restore them to his favour

and acceptance, 'tis necessary both that their past sins should be remitted and forgiven; and also that they should be washed, sanctified and purified from their defilements, without which, men will never be made partakers of remission of sins that are past, and consequently of favour and acceptance with God.

“Now as these things are all that mankind wants, so God has provided a means for both these ends, (viz.) the Lord Jesus Christ, in whose name, and for whose sake, remission of sins that are past is preached, and reconciliation unto God promised; and for overcoming sin in the lust of it, and purifying and sanctifying the hearts of men, God through Jesus Christ, offers to mankind the help of his good spirit, as a lively principle of virtue, power and efficacy, for these good purposes: So that christianity is in all respects a perfect institution, completely answering all the ends of religion, which are the glory of God and the happiness of mankind. And therefore, in the entrance of this our friendly advice, we earnestly recommend to you, that you have a reverend regard to the christian doctrine in every part of it, and that you be humbly thankful to God, who in his Providence has cast your lot in such an age and country, wherein the doctrine of Jesus Christ is publicly and freely preached, and the means of salvation taught through him.

“And inasmuch as the evidence of our holy religion is such, both from the real excellency of it, as well as the external testimonies concerning it, recorded in the Holy Scriptures, which we have the greatest reason to believe, not only from the credibility of the history, (in which there is the completest evidence that can reasonably be required of any matters of fact at so great distance of time) but also, from the inward testimony of the Holy Spirit, sealing unto our spirits the truth of the gospel, in that blessed experience of the good fruits and effects of it, which is witnessed by all those who sincerely apply their hearts to believe its doctrines and obey its precepts: We therefore caution you to be very watchful and careful how you admit any doubts or questionings concerning it, in giving way to some pernicious notions, of late published to the world, least the sin of unbelief, in opposition to such clear evidence, should be at last charged upon such to their utter confusion and condemnation. We request you therefore that none be willingly ignorant or unbelieving, but that all apply themselves, not only to believe the great saving truths of the christian religion, but put in practice its pure and holy precepts, which have the truest tendency of any that were ever published to the world, to the perfecting human nature, and rendering mankind holy and happy.

“Having said thus much of the christian doctrine and precepts in general, we take the liberty to put you in remembrance of some particulars of our belief and practice agreeable thereto.

“First, We put you in mind of our ancient and constant faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ his eternal Son the true God, and in the Holy Spirit, one God blessed for ever more; and that our Society always did and still do, acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration. And we earnestly exhort you stedfastly to maintain and keep the same

faith pure and inviolable. And by all means we pray you avoid *the corrupt doctrines of deism and infidelity, which tend to irreligion and a vicious ungodly liberty; a liberty not from sin, but to sin and wickedness; a liberty to pull down all religion, and to set up none in the stead thereof, for ought that yet appears to the world, to the shame and scandal of all religion, and even of human wisdom and nature itself.*

Secondly, We put you in mind of our steadfast and constant testimony to the coming of Jesus Christ our Lord in the flesh, above seventeen hundred years ago, according to the christian account, when he was conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary, and after a life in this world as man, during the space of about three and thirty years, in the three last of which years (which was the time of his ministry) he wrought many real mighty miracles, lived a most exemplary life, and taught a most heavenly doctrine, gave himself up unto the shameful death of the cross, under Pontius Pilate the Roman Governor, then in Judea, and became a most satisfactory sacrifice and propitiation for the sins of the whole world, upon condition that men sincerely repent of their sins and truly turn to the Lord, by forsaking them, and amending and reforming their lives, and receive him as their Lord and Master, submitting themselves to the conduct of his Light and Spirit, in their minds and consciences; who was buried and rose again the third day from the dead by the power of the Father, and appeared oftentimes to his disciples after his resurrection, and gave them commission to preach the gospel unto all nations, baptizing them in, or into the name (that is power and virtue) of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as Peter did the first Gentiles which believed, who said, as I began to speak the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning; then, said he, remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost: He ascended into heaven about forty days after his resurrection, and sat down at the right hand of God the Father, making intercession for men, and giving gifts to them, yea to the rebellious also, that he by the sanctifying virtue of these gifts might prepare their hearts for himself, to dwell among them and in them by his most Holy Spirit: And from heaven he shall come to judge the living and the dead, in the great and general day of judgment, when all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and come forth, they that have done good to the resurrection of life (eternal) and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation. And all these doctrines we profess according to the plain literal sense of the Holy Scriptures, which therefore we earnestly exhort you steadfastly to believe, and zealously to maintain to the very end of your lives, notwithstanding all the opposition and cunning craftiness of deists and infidels who lie in wait to deceive you, men of corrupt minds, and reprobate, or of no judgment, concerning the faith.

“Thirdly, We put you in mind, that our friends from the beginning, have constantly held and maintained, that according to the Holy Scriptures, Christ Jesus our Lord, the Eternal Word, and

Wisdom of God, is the true Light (called so on account of his divine excellency), who enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world, John i. 9. with a Light or Gift, of his own Nature, the Life in him being the Light of men, John i. 4. and therefore superior to, and distinct from the more human light of our natural faculties; because it is no constituent part of men, as creatures, but purely the gift of God, superadded to them by Jesus Christ, for their information and assistance, in matters of religion, regarding the favour of God and their eternal salvation.

“And therefore *believe them not. who tell you, there is no need of the grace or help of Jesus Christ* to deliver you from the bondage and corruption of your depraved and sinful, because fallen, nature; but that you are self-sufficient, or able of yourselves, alone to save yourselves, without the assistance of Jesus Christ, or his grace, which doctrine he, of his infinite mercy, preserve us all from, as being inconsistent with, and destructive of true religion; and teach both you and us, and all men, to abstract our thoughts frequently, but especially in our solemn meetings, from all worldly things, and earthly ideas, to attend devoutly and sincerely, on the teaching and guidance of this heavenly principle, and gift of God, through Jesus Christ, his beloved Son, our Lord, to know and witness his blessed work of regeneration; which none can know and witness without him and his help, mortifying our sensual and sinful appetites and actions, called in the sacred writings, the deeds of the body, that we may live eternally, and raising in us heavenly desires, and bringing forth in us holy actions, since without holiness, no man shall see the Lord.

“And therefore we beseech all those who make profession with us, of the excellency and sufficiency of this divine principle and salutary grace, which during the time of God’s kind visitations to the souls of men, is always near to them, to help them, by the strength thereof to keep their hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, from wandering from it; in a stayed state on God, especially in our solemn assemblies, for this is worshipping him in spirit and truth, as our Saviour taught, John iv. 23. This is the way to have our hearts washed from wickedness, airiness, and wantonness, and instead thereof, to have Christ formed in us, Gal. iv. 19. and to be blessed with those habits of virtue and piety, which are necessary for rendering us children of God, and qualifying us for heirs of heaven.

“Fourthly, We stir you up by way of remembrance, that on our first becoming a separate people, for the service of God from other societies, our primitive Friends were very remarkable for their uprightness and honesty, in commerce and converse; they were very exact in performing their words and promises, without shuffling and evasive excuses, and insincere dealings, to the credit and reputation of the Society; much less did they by wheedling and deceitful pretences, involve themselves in a multitude of things and affairs, which they had not understanding and stock of their own to manage; and contract great debts which they knew they were not able to pay, and thereby impose upon, and cheat their honest neigh-

bours, under sanctified pretences of religion and holiness ; which abominations, we find ourselves obliged to solemnly testify against." It thus concludes,

“ And now, Brethren, we commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified, through faith, in our Lord Jesus Christ.

“ Published at our Men's Meeting, in the city of Bristol, the 3d of the 11th month, 1731. And at their appointment, signed on their behalf.

ALEX. ARSCOTT.”

Notwithstanding considerable care has been taken in examining the sheets, we regret to find that some typographical errors have escaped notice. Though none of them materially affect the sense, yet we have thought it best to collect them as an Errata.

Page 6,	line 13	from the bottom, omit <i>in</i> before <i>writing</i> .
24,	6	insert <i>that</i> , between <i>station</i> and <i>he</i> .
"	18	from the top, <i>all from</i> read <i>from all</i> .
25,	4	for <i>created flesh</i> read <i>created from the earth</i>
"	7	for <i>ure we all to have</i> read <i>we all have</i>
"	12	from the bottom, insert <i>of</i> before <i>it</i> .
27,	9	for 252 read 250.
28,	16	from the top, for <i>this truth</i> read <i>his truth</i> .
"	18	omit <i>you</i> before <i>another</i> .
"	22	for <i>spiritual</i> read <i>a spiritual</i> .
33,	1	from bottom, for <i>of</i> read <i>with</i> .
42,	26	insert <i>two</i> before <i>points</i> .
"	22	for <i>Vol. II.</i> read <i>Vol. I.</i>
54,	22	for <i>it thus</i> read <i>it is thus</i>
58,	23	for <i>to read unto</i> .
"	25	for <i>them</i> read <i>whom</i> .
60,	18	from top, read <i>into</i> for <i>unto</i> .
66,	12	omit the word <i>own</i> .
73,	4	for <i>collected</i> read <i>collated</i> .
85,	32	for page 77 read page 79.
86,	16	for <i>giving a</i> read <i>giving us a</i>
88,	13	for <i>light is one</i> read <i>light one</i> .
90,	27	for <i>description</i> read <i>discussaon</i> .
95,	25	after <i>himself</i> insert <i>or self condemned</i> .
103,		bottom line, for <i>sin</i> read <i>sins</i> .
105,	14	from the bottom, for <i>when</i> read <i>where</i> .
123,	6	from the top, for <i>in</i> read <i>for</i> .
129,	19	from the bottom, for <i>God</i> read <i>God's</i> .
130,	17	for <i>sacrifice</i> read <i>sacrifices</i> .
132,	11	from the top, for <i>man out of</i> read <i>man from out of</i> .
133,	11	from the bottom, for <i>the High Priest</i> read <i>their High Priest</i> .
134,	18	from the top, for <i>delighteth</i> read <i>delighted</i> .
136,	15	omit <i>that</i> .
141,	10	for page 118 read page 121.
151,	15	for <i>when</i> read <i>where</i> .
156,	2	from the bottom, omit <i>the</i> before <i>reading</i> .
161,	11	from the top, for <i>all calummies</i> read <i>all the calumnies</i>
170,	21	for <i>Baptists</i> read <i>Baptist</i> .
"	28	for <i>opinions</i> read <i>opinion</i> .
"	5	from the bottom, for <i>the Scriptures</i> read <i>Scriptures</i>
171	16	for <i>so confine</i> read <i>so to confine</i> .
189	19	for <i>salvation</i> read <i>salutation</i> .
194	6	from the top, for page 147 read page 145.
196	13	from the bottom, for <i>hold</i> read <i>held</i> .
200	6	for <i>whole world</i> read <i>world</i> .
227	3	from the top, for <i>the two opponents</i> read <i>two opponents</i>
239	10	from bottom, for <i>within one</i> read <i>within the one</i> .
"	9	for <i>the the other</i> read <i>the other</i> .
238	16	from the top, for <i>this</i> read <i>the</i> .
240	12	from the bottom, for <i>this Society</i> read <i>the Society</i> .
245	19	from the top, for <i>Spirit</i> read <i>the Spirit</i> .
255	2	from bottom, for <i>three what</i> , read <i>what three</i> .



